THE

LABOUR MONTHLY

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

Editor: R. PALME DUTT

Volume 16 August, 1934 Number 8

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Notes of the Month

THE FIGHT AGAINST WAR R.P.D.

1914 and 1934 R. PAGE ARNOT

June 30th and the Revolutionary Development in Germany ERNST HENRI

Replies to a Questionnaire on WAR

ALEX GOSSIP
LAURENCE HOUSMAN
MAJOR T. GRENFELL
TOM MANN
PROFESSOR GARDINER
etc.

PROFESSOR J. L. STOCKS
REGINALD REYNOLDS
J. MAXTON, M.P.
ERNST TOLLER
REGINALD BRIDGEMAN
etc.

7 JOHN STREET, Theobald's Road, LONDON, W.C.1

PRICE SIXPENCE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY PUBLICATIONS

MARXISM AFTER FIFTY YEARS.

R. PALME DUTT.

2d. each (2½d. post free).

12 copies 1s. 6d.; 50 copies 6s. 3d. (7s. 0d. post free); 100 copies 12s. 0d. (13s. 3d. post free).

HOW LENIN STUDIED MARX.

N. KRUPSKAYA.

1d. each (1½d. post free).

12 copies 9d.; 50 copies 3s. 2d. (3s. 8d. post free); 100 copies 6s. 0d. (7s. 0d. post free).

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM AND COMMUNISM.

32 pages. 3d. (3½d. post free).

12 copies 2s. 3d.; 50 copies 9s. 4d. (10s. 4d. post free); 100 copies 18s. 0d. (19s. 9d. post free).

Of all Workers' Bookshops or Newsagents, or direct from the Labour Monthly Office.

The place to buy Marxia literature is COLLET'S

e.g. **Fascism and Social Revolution.** R. P. Dutt. 5/

Dialectical Materialism. V. Adoratsky. 2

Germany Unmasked. R. Dutt. 5

Hitler over Europe. Ernst Henri. 1

William Morris. R. P. Arnot.

Condition of the Working Class. Allen Hutt.

Ten Days that Shook the World. John Reed

and all Kerr publications (Marx, Engels, etc

***66 Charing Cross Road, Londo**

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

VOLUME 16 AUGUST, 1934 NUMBER 8

Editor: R. PALME DUTT

CONTENTS

Notes of the Month - - - - - - - Page 451
THE FIGHT AGAINST WAR
By R. P. D.

A Questionnaire on War - - - - - - „ 465
I. Report and Analysis
II. Representative Replies
III. Extracts from other Replies

1914 and 1934 - - - - - - - - - „ 488
By R. PAGE ARNOT

War from the Air - - - - - - - „ 497
By T. H. WINTRINGHAM

The 30th of June and the Revolutionary Development in Germany - - - - - - „ 502
By ERNST HENRI

Published at
7 JOHN STREET, Theobald's Road, LONDON, W.C.1.
A

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Labour Monthly

Editorial and Publishing Offices :
7 JOHN STREET, LONDON, W.C.1.
Telephone : HOLBORN 6656

¶ The Editor of *The Labour Monthly* invites contributions. He cannot, however, be held responsible for MSS. sent to him or undertake to enter into correspondence regarding rejected contributions, although every endeavour will be made to return the same when a stamped and addressed envelope for that purpose is enclosed.

1934 : *Subscription Rates*
(PAID IN ADVANCE)

British Isles :

One year - 7/- Six months - 3/6

Abroad :

One year 8/- or $2.00. Six months 4/- or $1.00

American Subscription Representative :—Philip Novick, 270 Broadway, Suite 1401, New York City, U.S.A.

The Labour Monthly is also obtainable wholesale from The Workers' Bookshop, 38, Clerkenwell Green, E.C.1.

Advertisement Rates : £8 os. od. per cover page and pro rata. £5 os. od. per text page and pro rata (⅛th page minimum).

BOUND VOLUMES

Volume I	£5 os. od.	*Volume IX*	£1 1s. od.
Volume II	£3 3s. od.	*Volume X*	15s. od.
Volume III	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XI*	10s. 6d.
Volume IV	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XII*	10s. 6d.
Volume V	£2 2s. od.	*Volume XIII*	10s. 6d.
Volume VI	£1 10s. od.	*Volume XIV*	10s. 6d.
Volume VII	£1 10s. od.	*Volume XV*	10s. 6d.
Volume VIII	£1 1s. od.		

Loose copies of last five volumes can be exchanged for a bound volume for 4s. 6d. Single loose copies are available of almost every issue of *The Labour Monthly* since 1921.

The articles in *The Labour Monthly* are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A. as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

War Signs—Labour Monthly Questionnaire—Practical Problems —Are We Ready ?—Advance on 1914*—Working Class and Anti-War Movement—Urgent Tasks—Political Problems—Colonial Question—Soviet Foreign Policy—Build Iron Wall of Soviet Defence— Concrete Practical Tasks—Remember* 1914 *—"Anti-War" Prattle—Expose the Phrasemakers—Labour Party a War Party—The Fight Against War*

URGENT, inescapable, practical questions of the fight against war confront us on this twentieth anniversary of the first world war. It is no longer a question of whether war is drawing close upon us. The roaring armaments factories in every country answer this question ; the feverish rising race in aeroplane building programmes, in naval programmes, in chemical preparations, in preparations of strategic bases throughout the world, the ever closer spinning of the webs of secret diplomacy, of alliances and counter-alliances, all proclaim the approach of war. *The armaments race is the thermometer of the world's rising war-fever : and the verdict of that thermometer can no more be concealed to-day than in the years before* 1914. Capitalism, reeling on the rocks, reeling to disaster in Germany, in the United States, in Japan, all over the world, is driving to war as the supreme gamble. The political and ideological signs are no less serious. The advance of fascism means the advance of war ; the shaking and crisis of fascism, which has already begun, only accelerates the drive to war as the last resort. War is in every speech, in every newspaper. And now also the Labour leaders, the channels of capitalism's lead to the masses, begin to come out openly for war, for support of "their own" country in war ; the recent utterances of Lansbury, Henderson, Bromley, Swales are signposts ; the coming Labour Party Conference and Trades Union Congress

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are to be presented by their leadership with a new programme for dropping even the old pretence of the general strike against war and accepting beforehand "the duty of supporting our Government unflinchingly" in the coming war. These are ominous signs. *The issues of war are staring us in the face. The question calls aloud for answer: What must we do? What are we doing? Are we ready?*

IN this situation of rising war-danger the LABOUR MONTHLY issued its questionnaire on the problems of the fight against war to readers, sympathisers and others interested in the anti-war movement. The purpose of this questionnaire was a limited and practical one. It was not the object to produce the usual "symposium" of miscellaneous general views from a handful of notabilities whose opinions are already sufficiently familiar and only echo the existing lines of imperialism. The aim was to reach representatives of those seriously wishing to fight war, both within the militant working class movement, among trade unionists, members of the Labour Party and Independent Labour Party, co-operators and the labour youth, and also within the ranks of the middle class intellectuals, among scientists, university lecturers and teachers, writers, artists and other professions, and students, and to elicit from these their views of the tasks and methods of the fight against war. The results, which are of considerable interest, are summarised and analysed elsewhere in this issue, and a number of representative replies and extracts from replies are published.

WHAT is the general conclusion which may be drawn from these replies and from the issues raised by them? It is not possible nor necessary for present purposes to deal with all the issues raised in these replies. The fact that a Professor of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy at Cambridge can write in his reply that "war is a necessary result of over-population . . . the best way to prevent war is to spread knowledge, that knowledge the underlying facts of population and its control," or that the Jenkinson Lecturer in Embryology at Oxford writes that war is as inevitable as "natural insanity,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disease or death . . . the only way to minimise the risk of war is to talk less about it, above all, less nonsense, to realise that certain unpleasant things are unavoidable in this world and to face the honest fact that when men are really angry and embittered, they will fight for what they want even with fists and sticks and stones: thoughts are better concentrated in other directions," is only of significance as an indication that even very distinguished professors of science under the existing régime can be considerably less than scientific outside their speciality. It is sufficiently established by competent authorities that, even with existing resources and knowledge, the earth can maintain in abundance a very much greater population than the present (the statistician, Sir George Knibbs, estimated it at four times the existing world population); from this it necessarily follows that the so-called "over-population" is no absolute, natural phenomenon, but solely relative to the existing social system, and that consequently the driving force to war must be sought, not in any abstract conception of "over-population," but in the existing social system. These issues, however, would require separate discussion; and the replies in which they occur are not typical. The overwhelming majority, including all working-class contributors without exception, saw clearly enough the connection between present-day war and the existing social system. But what is important for present purposes is the view expressed of the tasks and methods of the fight against war, both at the present moment, and in the event of the outbreak of war.

THE replies may be regarded in the main, omitting a few exceptions and accidents, as representative of a section of the more conscious and articulate elements within the active anti-war movement in Britain to-day or among those more or less sympathetic to its aims. The types of open imperialist support of "one's own" country in war, or of official or governmental bourgeois "pacifism," claiming to seek the prevention of war through diplomatic machinery, the League of Nations, &c., and declaring readiness to support imperialist war in the case of "legal" war, "defensive" war, &c. (*i.e.*,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the official Liberal-Labour line), were only slightly represented. The main trends covered the range from active mass struggle against war, with or without conscious revolutionary aim, to abstentionist pacifism, and all the many phases between these. Of the six questions asked, one was theoretical, to bring out the general social outlook and approach to the question of war; the remainder were practical, on the line of action in the event of war by British Imperialism, in the event of colonial war for liberation, in the event of imperialist war on the Soviet Union, and on the present tasks of the fight against war and the question of the united working class front. On the basis of the replies received it is possible to discuss further the present situation and outlook of the existing anti-war movement in Britain. How far have we reached common ground and clearness of line? How far have the lessons of the war of 1914 and of the subsequent twenty years been learnt? How far is there preparedness for the realities of the threatening second world war and of the present struggle against war?

UNDOUBTEDLY the dominant trend of the replies reveals a definite measure of advance in outlook on the general outlook of the anti-war movement in Britain in 1914. At that time the bulk of anti-war opinion, also within the militant working class elements, when faced with the reality of war, only reached in the majority of cases to the pacifist or non-participation line. The international socialist line of utilising the war crisis for the development of revolutionary mass struggle for the overthrow of capitalism was only recognised by a small minority. The Independent Labour Party, led by MacDonald and Snowden, apostles of "national defence" and only diplomatically criticising the origin and conduct of the war and calling for "peace by negotiation," was able to dominate the anti-war movement until the later stages when the mass struggle, under the stimulus of the Russian Revolution, began to force its way through despite the weakness of revolutionary political leadership. The militant workers and socialists who followed the lead of the Independent Labour Party were

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thus turned into the tail of bourgeois pacifism ; the I.L.P. was tied to the chariot of a Lansdowne or a Wilson.

TO-DAY an ideological change is clearly visible, not merely in the working-class vanguard, but in roughly all those strata which twenty years ago followed the lead of the Independent Labour Party as the apparent leader of opposition to war. The teachings of Leninism are beginning to exert a widening influence. Of these replies, nine-tenths of which came, not from Communists, but from social democratic and non-party workers and intellectuals, the dominant trend, representing roughly one half, declared, with greater or less clearness, for revolutionary mass struggle against " one's own " Government in the event of war and against the illusions of abstentionist pacifism ; the line of abstentionist pacifism, though still largely represented by about one third, was relatively in a minority. This is symptomatic of a wider general process which is undoubtedly taking place, and which is above all the significance of the Amsterdam and Bermondsey Anti-War Movement. *The revolutionary working class is establishing more and more clearly, in the eyes of all, its political leadership and hegemony in the fight against war. The intellectuals and petit-bourgeois pacifists who wish seriously to assist the fight against war are finding themselves more and more compelled to orientate themselves towards the leadership of the revolutionary working class as the only leadership which conducts the fight against imperialist war.*

BUT, having registered this undoubted development taking place, can we for a moment rest satisfied with the position as so far reached ? Obviously not. First, it is evident that the existing anti-war movement, on the basis of Amsterdam and Bermondsey, is still weak and reaching only a fraction of those needing to be reached, of the trade unionists and Labour Party workers, of the unemployed, of the youth, of the women, of the intellectuals and petit-bourgeois elements, from among whom millions need to be and can be won to a great common front of struggle against war and fascism ; that our

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

propaganda is minute compared to the overwhelming war propaganda of imperialism on every side ; and that the powerful machine of the Labour Party and trade union central leadership is now directly linked to the imperialist war machine. We are in fact only at the beginning of our preparations, at the same time as imperialism is reaching the completion of its preparations. It is true that the actual outbreak of war would inevitably bring a rapid shifting of forces, and would, after the first wave of imperialist-organised war fever, give place, in the midst of general destruction and misery, to a rapid increase of the forces of revolution and weakening of the basis of imperialism. The ultimate balance of forces and victory of the revolution is not in doubt, although the degree of destruction and even of possible successive wars which may have first to be gone through depends on the degree and rate of development of our action. *But it is not the object of the anti-war movement to await the outbreak of war in order to develop its strength. The object of the anti-war movement is to mobilise and organise such mass forces already in the present period of the menace of war as can check the immediate outbreak of imperialist war and prepare the way for the conversion of the gathering war crisis into the struggle for the overthrow of imperialism.*

SECOND, there is still much unclearness of line even within the existing anti-war movement. It is not only that the delusions of abstentionist pacifism—the most dangerous line for the self-isolation and political sterilisation of the opponents of war, leaving free play to imperialism—are still widely prevalent, as revealed in a considerable minority of the answers, both among the workers answering and among the intellectuals, and are not yet at all actively enough fought in Britain, where these conceptions have strong roots. But even outside the openly pacifist minority, there are signs of unclearness of political orientation, such as can lead to serious danger of confusion in the concrete conditions of the outbreak of war. This was illustrated in a number of the answers over the issue of a colonial war for liberation, over the Soviet Union foreign policy, or on the conditions of general strike action against war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ON the question of a colonial war there were widespread tendencies, either to more or less open indifference, or to pseudo-socialist " superiority " to issues of national oppression, or, in the majority of cases, to a merely benevolent " liberal " attitude of approval in principle of the right of self-determination. There was not widely spread the understanding of the vital importance for the anti-war movement actively to support such a war of liberation (the paradox is only on the surface) as one of the most important weapons for weakening imperialism. Yet it is only necessary to consider how intimately all the inter-imperialist conflicts are bound up with the colonial question, how, for example, the issue of China is one of the outstanding conflagration points for the future world war, to see how important is a correct relation of the anti-war movement to the colonial struggle. It is just here that pacifism, the old abstract " no more war " pacifism, shows its ugliest character as the tool of imperialism, as when the I.L.P. during the last war condemned the Irish Easter Rebellion, or when the " pacifist " Lansbury in the Labour Government crushed in blood the risings in India and Burma. It is indispensable for the anti-war movement, if it is not to become the tool of imperialism, actively to support every revolutionary colonial struggle for liberation. This is of especial importance for the British anti-war movement.

THE question of a correct understanding of Soviet foreign policy is even more urgent : for here we reach the burning ground where is the closest menace of future world war, the war of imperialism on the Soviet Union. Despite general support for the Soviet Union and its peace policy, there were some tendencies revealed, on the one side, to pacifist illusions with regard to this policy, on the other side, to anti-pacifist criticisms, criticisms of relations with Fascist States, the League of Nations, &c. Here above all there is no room for any wavering or confusion ; the slightest such is a concession to imperialism and assists to build up the front against the Soviet Union. The sharpest, hardest, most uncompromising realist revolutionary

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

understanding is essential of the conditions of existence of the first workers' state which has to maintain its power in the midst of a world of imperialism, so long as the workers in the other countries are not yet advanced enough to be able to overthrow their imperialist masters. Lenin long ago laid bare these conditions, especially in the Brest-Litovsk controversy, how the workers' state requires to manœuvre in every possible way, so long as the workers in the other countries are not ready, to play on the contradictions of imperialism, to be ready even to enter into temporary alliances and combinations with one set of imperialist robbers against another, &c. Yet the voice of "infantilist" criticism (not always so innocent in origin) is still continually raised to spread wavering and doubts in the ranks of the more backward workers. The rôle of the I.L.P. leadership will be remembered over the renewal of the German-Soviet Treaty in 1933, which served at a critical moment to make a break in the front of the Four Power Pact. Similarly, more recently, some anti-militarist comrades criticised the presence of Soviet military representatives at the Hendon Air Display—as if it were not just as much the task of our comrades of the Soviet Union to maintain the maximum military efficiency, and to utilise every opportunity to learn from the enemy, as it is our task to destroy the power of imperialism from within, both sides being simply two sides of a single fight.

A NEW wave of similar confusionism, both conscious and unconscious, both pacifist and anti-pacifist, may be expected over the question of the Soviet Union and the League of Nations, more especially when bourgeois pacifism and social fascism attempts for the moment to throw the slime of its "approval" over the Soviet Union in order the better to discredit it with the working masses. All such attacks, both open and concealed, can only be met by completely clear-headed, patient, untiring explanation of every issue of Soviet foreign policy in relation to the revolutionary struggle against war and imperialism. If there is any wavering in our ranks at the present stage of relatively easy contradictions, what can we expect when the real conditions of war have to be faced, when

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the revolutionary soldiers of the Soviet Union have to fire on their brothers, the innocent conscripted workers and peasants of, say, Japan, to drop bombs which may injure civil populations, when the world's press will be filled with flaming stories of Soviet "atrocities," "barbarism," "aggression," &c. *We need to harden and strengthen the understanding of all the workers for these realities, to prepare them to keep clear and unshaken their class-sense which will alone enable them to judge correctly every event, to prepare them, not for easy "victories of peace," but for the harsh realities and needs of a life-and-death struggle.* We need to learn to fight actively and militantly for every issue of Soviet foreign policy as our own, not to be satisfied with the paper defences of the applause of the pacifist sheep at the manifest pacific will of Soviet policy, but to build an iron wall of defence of the Soviet Union of the working masses in conscious unity with the workers of the Soviet Union in a common fight.

THIRD, the recognition in principle of the line of active mass struggle against "one's own" Government in imperialist war is still only a beginning, can still be a long way from the understanding and facing of the issues that this involves and the practical tasks necessary for its realisation. In general, the tendency is still noticeable to treat war in the abstract or in isolation from other issues and from the general political situation, to meet it with a general line or propaganda for a general line, and not to face closely enough the concrete conditions of the struggle against war and the concrete conditions in which war is actually likely to develop. Much of the discussion of the question of general strike action against war illustrated this ; the almost universal approval of its desirability, alongside widespread doubts of its possibility, recalled too much similar discussions before the last war. Along these lines there cannot be preparedness. Only a few endeavoured to grapple more concretely with the conditions and tasks of developing the mass movement of struggle against imperialism and war, both in the present gathering war crisis and under the conditions of war, utilising every form of struggle, according to the given stage,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

including the general strike, and rising to the open revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of imperialism.

REMEMBER how 1914 *came*—this is the all-important lesson to recall on the present twentieth anniversary. The imperialist staffs on either side had their plans all prepared. The workers were caught unprepared. Why? There was no lack of previous warnings and propaganda for many years beforehand. There was no lack of a worked-out line. Since seven years before, the line had been worked out in the successive Congresses of the Second International. There was, to all appearance, no lack of organisation; twelve million workers were affiliated to the old Second International. There was no lack of promises and pledges from the leaders. Yet all this proved paper castles. Why? The treachery of the leaders? Yes: 1914 was a very, very great treachery of the reformist leaders, the greatest in the history of socialism. But this treachery, like all treachery, had its social basis. For in truth the whole policy and organisation and daily practice of the old parties of the Second International was unfitted for the carrying out of the formal revolutionary line of the struggle against war, of the conversion of the imperialist war into civil war. Soaked in reformist adaptation to the existing capitalist state, how could they in one night become organisations of mortal war against the capitalist state, and this in the midst of the greatest confusion, uncertainty, fear, invasion and the resurgence of all the old national emotions and spreading of a millionfold imperialist lies? Only a Bolshevik Party could stand this test. If the interests of the workers were proclaimed by reformism to be bound up with "their" capitalist state, then the line of "national defence" (actually, mutual slaughter for the interests of imperialism), necessarily followed: they must go to war in its "defence" against their fellow workers. The old opportunist International foundered on this rock; opportunism was laid bare in its true colours; the issue of war only laid bare the basic issues of the class struggle. Only as the workers began to learn in mud and in blood the lie of this teaching of opportunism, and to turn to revolutionary struggle,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

first in Russia, where they had a Marxist revolutionary party to lead them, and then in Germany, where was the next strongest Marxist leadership, only then the revolution of the workers in Russia and in Germany brought the war to an end.

SINCE the war the reformist leaders, who had been the Government Ministers of the warring imperialisms and had hounded the workers to slaughter, crept together anew to make again a paper "International" and issue noisy calls of "War on War!" "Never Again!" and "General Strike against War!" The Rome Congress of the International Federation of Trade Unions in 1922 proclaimed:

> The International Congress declares that it is the task of the organised workers to counteract all wars which may threaten to break out in the future with all the means at the disposal of the Labour Movement, and to prevent the actual outbreak of such wars by proclaiming and carrying out an international general strike.

The Vienna Congress of the International Federation of Trade Unions in 1924:

> reaffirms that it is the duty of the working class, organised nationally and internationally, to resist war in the most energetic way by stopping the manufacture of arms and munitions, by effecting an economic blockade, and by declaring the international general strike.

The Second International in its Manifesto of July, 1924, proclaimed:

> We must unite internationally in order to prepare every form of international defence against war, including the general strike.

The Labour Party and Trades Union Congress were parties to all these declarations. At the moment when, with the actual approach of war, these empty promises, these worthless, unbacked cheques are being hastily recalled by their own authors so as not to impede their rallying once anew to the defence of their own imperialist Governments in war, it is worth reminding members of the Labour Party and of the Trades Union Congress of this old lying talk of their leaders and asking them to compare it with the pro-war and anti-general-strike resolution which is now to be presented to them.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE bubble of this lying "anti-war" talk was already pricked at the Hague International Peace Congress in 1922, organised under the auspices of the International Federation of Trade Unions, and which was attended by delegates of the Russian Trade Unions. In contrast to the flamboyant "International General Strike Against War" talk of the reformist delegates, the Russian delegates put forward a series of concrete proposals for the preparation and organisation of the struggle against war. These concrete proposals covered fourteen points, including the formation of committees of action in every country, trade union unity, ending of class co-operation and coalition with capitalism, a systematic campaign of propaganda against the conception of "national defence," propaganda against pacifist illusions, drawing the colonial masses into the struggle against war, formation of legal and illegal organisations in the military forces, &c. The resolution embodying these concrete proposals for the struggle against war was not allowed to be put by the Chairman of this "Anti-war" Congress. It may be noted that the Chairman of this Congress, who fully endorsed and accepted the flamboyant pledges of the "International General Strike Against War," but refused even to allow to be put the practical proposals of the Russian delegates, was J. H. Thomas.

TO-DAY, as war draws near and the time comes to meet their promises, the Labour leaders already hasten to eat their words, to repudiate even the talk of a general strike, to trample under foot the decision of the last Labour Party Conference "to take no part in war and to resist it with the whole force of the Labour Movement . . . including the General Strike," and instead to substitute:

> There may be circumstances in which the Government of Great Britain might have to use its military and naval forces in support of the League of Nations in restraining an aggressor nation.

and to proclaim:

> the duty of supporting our Government unflinchingly

in such an imperialist war against an "aggressor" duly certified by imperialist diplomatic machinery. Swales comes out at the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meeting of the National Committee of the Amalgamated Engineering Union to oppose a resolution for the withdrawal of members in the event of war on the Soviet Union and declares :

> If there were aggressive action against this country, I do not know that we should allow the aggressors to walk over us.

And Bromley looks forward to the possibility " even willingly to help our country in the case of war " (the same Bromley, it may be noted, was signatory in 1925, before war was close, of the " Ponsonby Peace Pledge " by which " We, the undersigned . . . hereby solemnly declare that we shall refuse to support or render war service to any Government which resorts to arms," signed, among others, by Bevin, Bondfield, Cramp, Swales and Bromley—more spurious promissory notes).

Well might the *Times* declare in satisfaction :

> There may still be a difference in measures to divide the Labour Party from others, but no longer is there the appearance of a difference in principle. . . . The only circumstance in which it is conceivable that this country would go to war are precisely those which the Labour statement would justify as resistance to outrageous aggression. (*Times*, June 30, 1934.)

" I JOINED the Labour Party," says the old poet, Laurence Housman, in his reply to our questionnaire (a sincere pacifist who entertained the unfortunate hope that the Labour Party might become a " Peace Party," but at any rate to his credit desired a " Peace Party " that should go in for " law breaking "), " because of the I.L.P.'s attitude towards war, in 1920. I shall cease to be an active member of the Labour Party if war is officially approved at the forthcoming Conference." Is it not obvious from the outset that the Labour Party is a War Party ? Was it not obvious from the whole Labour Party's record in the War ? Was it not obvious when the Labour Party ratified Versailles ? Was it not obvious when the first Labour Government increased armaments on its Conservative predecessor by millions of pounds ? Was it not obvious when the second Labour Government suppressed the Burmese Rebellion with 1,688 killed, as has recently been disclosed ? The new war resolution is only the coping stone, the direct preparation

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the near approaching imperialist war. *Is it not obvious that the fight against war can never come from a bourgeois governmental party, but only from the forces which fight capitalism, from the militant working class, from the rank and file trade unionists from the united working class front in union with all the sincere elements of the intellectuals and of the petit-bourgeois strata which seriously seek to fight war, and that the political leadership of this struggle against war, which is by its very nature a revolutionary struggle* (" law breaking "—well said ; that is the first step) *or nothing, can only come from the sole revolutionary party which fights capitalism and imperialism to a finish, the revolutionary party of the working class, the Communist Party ?* The struggle against war and the revolutionary working-class struggle are inseparably bound up ; this is the first beginning of the under standing of the real fight against war. Only this understanding can lead to the true practical tasks of the struggle against war, in place of the empty " anti-war " phrases of reformism and pacifism. These are still hard truths for many sincere haters of war ; but the facts of world history and world politics are daily driving them home anew ; and more and more are coming to understand them. Along these lines we must go forward, building up a new type of revolutionary anti-war movement of mass struggle, such as has not before been known in Britain, and such as can alone be fitted to meet the shocks of the ever closer threatening renewed imperialist war.

R. P. D.

Owing to extreme pressure of space it has been necessary to hold over Book Reviews, Publications Received, and also a further instalment in the series of extracts from the Correspondence of Marx and Engels on the British Working-Class Movement. Previous instalments in this series were printed in the issues of September, October and November, 1933, and February, March, April, May and June, 1934. Copies of these numbers can be obtained from the LABOUR MONTHLY, *7 John Street, London, W.C.1, at the price of 6d. each (7d. post free).*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A QUESTIONNAIRE ON WAR

I. Report and Analysis

On the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the world war of 1914-18, and in face of the close menace of a second world war, the LABOUR MONTHLY decided to issue a questionnaire to a number of its readers, sympathisers and others on the urgent issues of the fight against war.

The Questionnaire was as follows :

(1) Do you think war can be prevented within the conditions of capitalism or imperialism ?

(2) In the event of war involving Britain, what would you do or recommend others to do ?*

(3) Do you support the peace policy of the Soviet Union ? In the event of imperialist war on the Soviet Union, what would be your attitude ?

(4) What is your attitude towards a war of a colonial people for liberation from British Imperialism ?

(5) What is your opinion of the possibility or desirability of general strike action against war ?

(6) What can be done now to fight war ? Is a United Front of all sections of the working class movement, irrespective of political affiliations, possible now to fight war, and if so, what should be its main tasks ?

---

*It would be interesting in answering this question also to define your attitude towards the statement of Mr. John Bromley, Secretary of the Locomotive Engineers and Firemen, that he " could conceive of circumstances when it would be to the interests of British trade unionism willingly to help our country in case of war."

This questionnaire was sent to 391 individual representatives in different spheres (militant trade unionists, co-operators, Labour Party and I.L.P. adherents, youth movements, scientists and university lecturers, and literary, professional and technical workers), who were readers of the LABOUR MONTHLY or had shown interest in the anti-war movement. In addition, the Questionnaire was printed in the July LABOUR MONTHLY.

79 replies were received up to the time of going to press. These may be grouped : Trade Union, 21 ; Co-operative, 3 ; Labour Party and I.L.P., 7 ; Labour Youth, 3 ; Scientists, 9 ; other University Lecturers and Teachers, 8 ; Students, 6 ; Writers and Artists, 9 ; Clergy, 3 ; other Professions (lawyers, doctors, engineers, secretarial), 10.

The number of replies, in view of the extremely short notice, has considerably exceeded expectations, and has defeated the hope of printing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all replies ; even in the smallest type they would more than fill the whole of this month's issue. Accordingly, a representative collection of replies has had to be selected for printing ; the majority of these are given in full below ; where cuts have been made, for reasons of space, these have always been indicated (. . . .). In addition, extracts of passages of interest from a number of others are given. The LABOUR MONTHLY wishes to thank all who have been at pains to send in replies, and to express its apologies to those whose replies are not printed in this issue. A number of very interesting replies have been held over for publication in the September issue. All the replies received have been of great value to assist in giving a representative picture of the opinions held ; and all have been utilised in the analysis of the results given below.

It is hoped that the Questionnaire will have been of use for the aim intended—to assist in clarifying opinion and stimulating discussion on the practical problems of the fight against war.

Analysis of Replies Received

The questions were framed to stimulate discussion and constructive replies rather than any simple Yes or No. For this reason the replies do not admit of rigid classification ; and in any analysis of tendencies shown the existence of many marginal cases must be allowed for.

Nevertheless, it is possible, for purposes of classification, to distinguish very broadly four main tendencies :

(1) REVOLUTIONARY (with very varying degrees of clearness) : *i.e.*, advocacy of active mass struggle against war, including against " one's own " government, as a part of the struggle against capitalism and for the overthrow of capitalism.

(2) PACIFIST : advocacy of resistance to war by non-participation, conscientious objection, &c.

(3) RIGHT-WING LABOURIST : expression of opposition to " illegal " or " aggressive " war, but support of war on behalf of the " collective peace system," League of Nations, &c.

(4) OPEN IMPERIALIST : support of " one's own country " in war.

A general analysis of all the replies on this basis reveals the following proportions :

Revolutionary	51 per cent.
Pacifist	35 per cent.
Right-Wing Labourist	8 per cent.
Open Imperialist	6 per cent.

If a separation is made (only partially correct, without further analysis), of replies from organised workers in the first four groups (Trade Union, Co-operative, Labour Party and I.L.P., and Labour Youth), and of replies from intellectuals (Scientists, University Professors and Teachers,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Students, Writers, Artists, and other Professions), the following proportions appear :

	Workers	Intellectuals
Revolutionary	62 per cent.	42 per cent.
Pacifist	35 per cent.	36 per cent.
Right-Wing Labourist ..	3 per cent.	11 per cent.
Open Imperialist	0	11 per cent.

The five " Open Imperialist " answers, it may be noted, came from four University Professors and one Journalist.

This broad analysis leaves uncovered the very varying degrees of clearness in the " revolutionary " answers, especially on the question of the general strike as a weapon against war, and on the rôle of the colonial struggle. Only a small proportion of the " revolutionary " replies showed a clear grasp of the real conditions of the fight, and of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the methods of the fight against war ; but the general classification " revolutionary " has here been used, not as a measure of full theoretical and practical clearness, but as an expression of the manifest will and intention of the writers.

Some notes are appended on the replies to particular questions. The issues raised are further discussed in the editorial Notes of the Month.

Question 1

This was not strictly a fair question, since the abstract issue " can be prevented " or otherwise, is fully undialectical, *i.e.*, takes no account of the interplay of the advance of capitalism to war, on the one hand, and of the advance of the class struggle to revolution, on the other ; just this interplay of forces determines the outcome.

For this very reason, however, the question was useful in stimulating expression of the general theoretical outlook of contributors, although any consequent analysis of " Yes " or " No " answers is misleading.

The majority (48) answered No : *i.e.*, that war cannot be prevented within the conditions of capitalism or imperialism. Two of these answers (from Professors) were based on the view that war is inevitable under all forms of society ; the remainder were based on the view that war is inherent in capitalism ; two endeavoured to make a distinction between imperialism and capitalism.

Fifteen answered Yes : *i.e.*, that war can be prevented under capitalism. Four of these represented the bourgeois or reformist view that war can be prevented under capitalism by suitable diplomatic machinery, &c. The remaining 11 represented the view that working class action can prevent war under capitalism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sixteen gave a qualified answer : *i.e.*, that war is ultimately an inevitable outcome of capitalism, if capitalism is not overthrown, but that the outbreak of war at a given moment can be delayed or postponed by working-class action.

Question 2

The answers to this question reveal a definite measure of advance of opinion within the anti-war movement in Britain since 1914, when the overwhelming majority of opponents of war after the outbreak of war only reached to the pacifist or non-participation line, and the international socialist line of utilising the war crisis for the development of revolutionary mass struggle against capitalism was recognised by only a small minority.

Of the present answers, 35 expressed the intention, with greater or less degrees of clearness, to utilise their positions, in the event of war by British Imperialism, to promote active mass struggle against the Government. Five expressed the intention to " resist " or " oppose " war, without more exact explanation. Nineteen expressed the intention to " refuse to fight," " take no part," " hold aloof," " stand by and look on." Six advocated propaganda against war, without discussing further their personal line of action. Three declared that " nothing can be done," once war has begun. Eleven indicated possible support of war by British Imperialism, either in all cases (2), or in certain cases, " depends on circumstances," against " aggression," against a fascist country, in defence of the " collective peace system," &c.

On Bromley's utterance, 39 explicitly condemned Bromley's line, often (especially in the case of all trade unionists who answered on this) in very strong terms ; four (three intellectuals and one co-operator) expressed support of his line.

Question 3

Support of the Soviet Union peace policy was general. Sixty-two declared support ; and the majority added declarations of their support of the Soviet Union in the event of imperialist war upon it.

Fourteen expressed qualified support, or varying degrees of criticism. Of these, one was openly hostile to the Soviet Union, three expressed inability to understand Soviet foreign policy ; ten expressed criticism on questions of peace pacts, disarmament proposals, relations to the League of Nations or to Fascist states. The criticisms in all cases came from intellectuals, plus one I.L.P. leader, and one Conservative non-unionist worker, a member of the British Legion (who in the rest of his answers declared opposition to war and readiness to support a general strike against war).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Question 4

On the colonial question the answers were extremely disappointing, and revealed how little a sufficient understanding of the vital importance of active struggle on this issue has spread so far even among the more politically conscious and advanced elements represented by the majority of those answering this questionnaire. The answer " indifferent " was openly given in one case ; another declared there was " no need " for a colonial war of liberation ; another that " it will not happen " ; another that it could not succeed ; another suspected that it might be " financed by a foreign Power."

Forty-eight declared support for the colonial peoples in any struggle for liberation. The support, however, was in the majority of cases only expressed as a support in principle, a recognition of the right to liberation, without recognition of the responsibility of active assistance in the fight against the common enemy : in other words, a benevolent neutrality. " Let the colonial subjects carry on with it free and unhindered " was the expression of one contributor. Only a minority showed understanding of the necessity of all measures of practical assistance in the fight.

Twenty-four expressed critical views, ranging from the pacifist line that the colonial peoples should win freedom without a war, that " we " should " give " it to them, &c., or of offers to " refuse to fight " as the practical contribution in the event of a colonial struggle, to direct opposition to colonial liberation, insistence that British Imperialism is not the only one, that liberation would only mean a change of masters, &c.

Question 5

On the answers with regard to general strike action against war, a numerical analysis is only of limited value, since the whole significance of any treatment of this issue depends on the accompanying political and organisational approach.

Sixty-one declared for the " desirability of general strike action against war," and only five (non-workers) declared it " not desirable." It is clear, however, that this abstract formulation can cover three separate lines : (1) the revolutionary line, which seeks to transform imperialist war into civil war ; (2) the pacifist line, which seeks to " oppose " war by non-resistance ; (3) the reformist line, which plays with the slogan of " the general strike against war " and thereby only creates empty illusions and unpreparedness for the real conditions of the struggle.

The answers on the question of " possibility " carried the expression of views a little further. Twenty-four expressed disbelief or doubt of the possibility, " impossible," " probably impossible," " no hope," " barely possible," " very doubtful," " very difficult," &c. ; many

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stressed the point that under the existing reformist leadership it was in practice impossible, others that the masses were not yet politically conscious enough. Twenty-seven expressed the view that it was possible, given adequate preparation, propaganda, organisation, leadership ; many stressed the point that it could only be achieved through militant rank-and file trade union organisation, and not through the existing leadership.

Only a small minority approached the question in more concrete fashion, as a part of the general revolutionary struggle against imperialist war, as dependent on the development of the mass movement through partial struggles, as more probably attainable in the course of a war and rising opposition than on its immediate outbreak, and as necessarily raising the issues of the struggle for power.

In general, the answers to this question revealed that Lenin's teaching on the question of the slogan of the general strike against war, notably set out in his Letter to the Hague Conference in 1922*, has not yet reached wide understanding in the anti-war movement, and that much more explanatory work is needed.

Question 6

The answers to this question on the tasks of the present fight against war, and on the issue of the united working-class front, covered a very wide ground, and included many valuable suggestions for the development of propaganda.

Thirty-six gave unqualified support for " a United Front of all sections of the working-class movement, irrespective of political affiliations, to fight war." Only seven (all non-workers) definitely rejected it as impossible, hopeless, " difference of opinion as to means between Communists and non-Communists is too great."

Twenty-one gave qualified support for a united front against war, but expressed reservations or doubts. Five of these demanded that " attacks should cease," that leaders should reach a " broader common outlook," that a common " socialist " basis should be reached, &c. Eleven held the view that an " all-in " united front was impossible or extremely doubtful, owing to the attitude of the Labour Party leadership, but that a wide united front could be built up, or a united front on a local basis. Five were doubtful whether any united front could serve more than a propagandist purpose or meet the test of a crisis : " when crisis comes, these united front bodies will collapse or split up, and the left sections should be ready to carry on with a definite policy," " bound to break down at the crucial moment," " the united front can do useful work of a secondary nature, but in the final analysis the only hope of preventing war or fascism lies in the Communist Party obtaining a decisive

* This letter is published in " The Attitude of the Proletariat Towards War," Modern Books, London, 6d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

influence in the trade unions." It is clear that there is here some dangerous misconception of the united front as a vague compromise alliance or bloc, and consequent false counterposing of the militant elements to the united working-class front.

Finally, 14 advocated other means than the united working-class front and working-class action for the fight against war—the League of Nations, pressure through Parliament and on M.P.s, propaganda for socialism, education, &c.

EDITOR, LABOUR MONTHLY.

II. Representative Replies.

From a delegate to the 1904 International Socialist Congress

1. War is a necessary part of Capitalism and Imperialism, and until both are destroyed, there will always be grave danger, but under certain circumstances I think it is possible to prevent a War if the people recognise clearly how they have been fooled in the past, and if they understand this they will also be able to crush both Capitalism and Imperialism. 2. Would do what I have done before in the South African War and the 1914-18 War, oppose it and try to convert others to the same view. I most strongly disagree with the statement alleged to have been made recently by Mr. John Bromley who is simply playing into the hands of the Warmongers. Our enemies are here, and not the Workers of other countries. 3. Yes, most certainly, and would do what I could to prevent it. 4. I am opposed to this or any other country dominating the peoples of other countries and believe that India, Africa, &c., should be free to govern themselves, and incidentally they could not make a worse mess of it than Britain. 5. A general strike is neither impossible nor yet inadvisable against War, but preparations for such should not be held over until the last moment.

6. At the present moment the idea of the United Front amongst all decent minded people is gaining ground as witness the present outcry against the Sedition Bill, the Unemployment Bill, Fascism and also against War and in various conferences and demonstrations, I have seen evidence of this.

One of our tasks should be to effectively show up the humbug of the last War to the people who may not have given sufficient study to the question and further to take an active part in the struggles of the workers against the Capitalist Class in whose interests Wars are made and link up the Anti-War movement.

ALEX GOSSIP

(*General Secretary, National Amalgamated Furnishing Trades' Association*).

Laurence Housman

1. War has sometimes been prevented under Capitalism and Imperialism: but both systems add greatly to the risk of war, and the difficulty of establishing peace. 2. War cannot involve Britain without Britain's consent. United Labour could prevent Britain taking part in any war. If "Trade" is to be the deciding factor, a war bringing temporary profit to Trade Unionism is conceivable. But it would be none the less damnable, or eventually disastrous, for that reason. 3. The Soviet Union has put forward various Peace proposals—all better than our own. I support most its first proposal for total disarmament. For answer to second question see above. 4. Most unnecessary for it to become a war, if we are in our moral senses. What we won by the sword

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we ought not to keep by the sword. 5. Perfectly possible if Labour were wholeheartedly against War—and very desirable.

6. I believe that Labour would have more power in this country to prevent war, and force the government to a real peace policy by declaring itself a definite Peace-Party (even to the extent of law-breaking). It might return fewer members to Parliament: but even if it returned none it would become a real power: and nothing would so hasten Socialism's day of power as the prevention of War. I would make refusal to vote for armaments a first plank in the Labour Platform. I joined the Labour Party because of the I.L.P.'s attitude towards war, in 1920. I shall cease to be an active member of the Labour Party if War is officially approved at the forthcoming Conference.

LAURENCE HOUSMAN.

From the President of a Co-operative Congress

1. No. 2. Inclined to agree with Bromley. Reluctant to express opinion; rather a matter for those of military age. 3. (*a*) Yes, so far as understood. (*b*) Against. 4. Depends upon the "people" and the circumstances. 5. No hope. 6. Intensive national and international development of the Co-operative Movement. Working class politics, as evident to-day, want this reorientation. And the Co-operative Movement wants revitalising, but offers the only platform broad enough upon which to combine all ranks in peaceful mutual development.

J. DOWNIE

(*E.C. member of the Co-operative Union, President of Annual Congress of Co-operative Union*, 1932).

Major T. Grenfell

1. Definitely no. 2. If recalled to service use every opportunity of stopping the war, of minimising the injury to the Workers on either side, and of bringing Capitalism to an end. I recommend everybody else, whether in or out of the service, to use a war-time crisis for the same ends. There is no circumstance under which a Marxian Socialist could find it in the interests of the Workers of any particular country to assist in a Capitalist or Imperialist war. A non-aggressive British Republic of Free Soviets attacked by an Imperialist power affords the only circumstance I can think of in which Mr. Bromley's hypothesis would be acceptable—certainly not in Imperialist Britain. 3. Yes. In such an event to give and to secure, overtly and covertly, active support for the U.S.S.R. and opposition to all its enemies. 4. Entire sympathy with the Colonials.

5. The present indications do not make one hopeful of the possibility of a successful General Strike. The Social-Democratic Movement in England, of which the Trade Unions form the major part, is largely Tory in its ideology; and could be easily hypnotised, as before, by the warmongers. The mobilisation of that large section of the Workers who could keep their heads in a war emergency is the next best thing to a General Strike. Such Workers could be used for Sectional Strikes. If, however, we seriously think of Strike action against war, then let it be practised now, in times of Peace. Let Strikes be a part of our Anti-War technique. Let us start, now, putting the wind up the warmongers.

6. A real United Front, in the sense of embracing large groups of those with serious political affiliations, is, at the moment, only a dream. The Social Democratic leaders in Britain are implacably hostile to ANY Anti-War front. Henderson and the others are really hangers-on of the National Government; and quite obviously have no intention whatever of opposing Capitalist war. Conservative, Liberal and Labour are terms which connote the same reaction when the national war spirit is abroad. An Anti-War Movement is a rebellion in political life; and a United Front is just a union of rebels. Consequently, any approach to those with political affiliations must be a straightforward effort to detach the rebels. The United Front needn't

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seek its strength in large numbers. Upon men and women of conviction, prepared for persecution, will the present generation have to depend for its supply of war-killing agents. For its technique the Movement cannot do better than stick to the Amsterdam and Bermondsey lines.

T. GRENFELL

(*Secretary, Bath Anti-War Committee*).

Tom Mann

1. Yes if we can speedily bring about mass industrial organisation (militantly directed) but such mass resistance to war would result in the Revolution.

2. I would advise a Conference of World Revolutionaries and be guided by the considered opinion of such as to best action to advance the World Revolution.

3. In entire agreement with the policy of Soviet Union, would act as the Communist Party advised.

4. Help them in every way to get complete freedom.

5. In thorough agreement with the General Strike against War, but plus all forms of industrial and other activity to make War impossible.

6. Concentrate immediately on United Front propaganda, specifically Anti-War and drop criticism of individuals to ensure success.

TOM MANN.

From a Locomotive Engineers Branch Chairman

1. While the intensification of the contradictions of capitalism inevitably impel capitalist states towards war, war is not inevitable within these conditions. The mobilisation of the mass of the people behind the leadership of the working class against war would compel the rulers to face the impossible task of conducting a war without the support of the masses. 2. As a railwayman and trade unionist, I would do everything within my power to win my fellow workers to a definite refusal to move troops and munitions. In doing this I would expose the class meaning of war and point out that the workers in the country or countries against which we were fighting are not our enemies. They, like us, would be exploited and sacrificed in the interests of the capitalist class as a whole. I would point out to the members of my union that our Secretary J. Bromley was assisting the capitalist class to deceive the workers. There is no war waged in the interests of capitalism, whether such war is waged against a country with a Fascist government or otherwise, that justifies the support of Trade Unionists. 3. (*a*) Yes. (*b*) I would point out to the workers the reasons for such a war. I would emphasise the need for solidarity with the workers of Russia and advocate mass action by means of strikes and demonstrations against the imperialists.

4. I would support such a war as it would be a practical step towards the freedom of the oppressed colonial masses, and the disintegration of the power of British Imperialism.

5. The general strike under the present conditions is the highest form of mass action and should therefore be supported. At the same time it would be necessary to show that the general strike in itself could not prevent war. Only the seizing of power by the workers and the clearing out of the war-mongers and imperialists can prevent the continuation of the war. 6. It is possible to obtain a United Front of all sections of the working class to fight war. The main tasks should be:—(1) The building up of strong all-in anti-war committees in every locality, Trade Unions, working class political parties, unemployed organisations, religious bodies, liberal minded intellectuals should all be invited to join. (2) Demonstrations against the building of a large army, air-force and navy. (3) The preparation within the Trade Union branches for strike action against the manufacture of munitions, gases, &c., also against the transport of troops. (4) A ruthless fight against and exposure of all Trade Union and political leaders who attempt to mislead the workers by conceiving circumstances when it would

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be in the interests of Trade Unionism to support war.

R. DARWEN

(*Chairman Bradford No. 1 Branch, Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen*).

From the Secretary of the University Labour Federation

1. War cannot be finally abolished under Capitalism ; it may be delayed. 2. That would depend on the government of the day. If the government was Conservative or Liberal I should refuse to fight and recommend others to do likewise on the ground that even if the war were fought against obvious aggression in defence of the Covenant, the government would abuse its victory. In other circumstances I would be willing to defend a system of pooled security, when and if that system were accompanied by some considerable measure of Disarmament, and some machinery for the revision of the political clauses of the Peace Treaties. I should in all circumstances be willing to defend a Socialist Britain from capitalist aggression.

3. I think the spirit in which the Soviet Union looks at the problem is so far as one can judge, good, but the policy is at the moment apparently changing. Until I know what the policy is becoming I am unable to judge. In the event of imperialist war on the Soviet Union, I would endeavour to hamper the imperialist aggressor, whether this or any other country. 4. I should favour the colonials. If they are sufficiently politically conscious to fight for political freedom, they deserve it. 5. I think a general strike both possible and desirable to resist War.

6. The fight against War is closely bound up with the positive Socialist case, and any action against war must imply positive Socialist propaganda leading to party political action. I think that a United Front on this issue is impossible.

JOHN FARNSWORTH

(*Secretary, University Labour Federation*).

Clough Williams-Ellis, F.R.I.B.A.

1. No. 2. Almost certainly abstain and so recommend others but there *might* be exceptions. 3. Yes. Pro-Soviet. 4. On general principles—pro-Colonial. 5. Possible and desirable. 6. Difficult, but possible under an *immediate* threat. If munition workers were made conscripts under military discipline and with less than military pay it might remove the temptation to tolerate war from the unemployed. Also, all munition works of every kind would pass under direct government control on a declaration of war, and no private profits or dividends would be permitted during a period of hostilities. Merely a special and necessary tax on a trade that has special dangers to the community.

CLOUGH WILLIAMS-ELLIS.

From a Co-operative Comrades' Circle (*answered by the Circle collectively.*)

1. No. 2. All remain conscientious objectors and advise others likewise. 3. Yes. We would use political action inside our country for the Soviet Union. 4. Take action for the freedom of the Colonies if it meant the workers having control and not the capitalists. 5. Left to comrades' discretion. 6. Get in contact with all organisations, scouts, churches, &c., and in every way spread the anti-war spirit.

(Miss) A. MOSS

(*Honorary Secretary, Park Branch, E.15, Comrades' Circle, London Co-operative Society, Education Department*).

From an A.E.U. Branch Chairman

1. No. Every historical development of capitalism increases the essential contradictions within the system. To stop war, the root cause capitalism, must be removed. The class which upholds this system must be crushed by the united power of the working class. We must be firmly united and absolutely ruthless in attaining our object. 2. I would

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

do everything in my power to wage an organised fight against our own capitalist government ; . . . the fight for the work-class in time of war is the fight against its own government—for the overthrow of the state and the setting up of a powerful workers' republic. This I would recommend others to do in what way they are able according to their various callings. British Trade Unionists as represented by us rank and file members " could conceive of circumstances " where Mr. John Bromley could play the rôle of his illustrious fellow politician Mr. Arthur Henderson as a member of a war cabinet. No doubt Mr. John Bromley and others of his kidney remember the disgraceful betrayal in 1914 when the Second International, after an orgy of militant anti-war resolutions, finally collapsed, its members fled to the aid of their own capitalist governments and generally functioned as recruiting sergeants, rallying the rank and file of their own labour and trade union movement for capitalist cannon fodder . . . The reformist T.U. leaders, the toadies of the capitalist class, are preparing the ground early for another blood bath, and herein lies our greatest danger—the workers are still looking to these social fascists for a class lead. 3. The peace policy of the Soviet Union has my support and in my opinion is worthy of the support of every member of the international working class . . . In the event of imperialist war on the Soviet Union there can be one and only one correct attitude for me and others of my class—we must support the workers' republic by every means in our power . . .

4. I regard a war of liberation of a colonial people as one which calls for the support of the British working class, not for our own government, but for the subject people. As I have already stated, Imperialism is the enemy of the working class, therefore every influence which tends to weaken its power is of advantage to the working class. Such an influence is a national war of a subject people for liberation from British Imperialism. Even though the war may be one led by the national bourgeoisie of the subject nation, it is one more nail in the coffin of imperialism—one step nearer to the final overthrow of our class enemy. It is absolutely essential that we should not take up a neutral attitude to a war of this character—we cannot countenance any passivity which will help British Imperialism to strengthen its dominance over our class. Many different stratas of society can be rallied against Imperialism—those who fight against imperialism fight for us, we must support them.

5. I am in favour of general strike action against war. The general strike is one of the most powerful weapons in the hands of the working class. A general strike must not, however, be held back as a weapon against war until the war is in full swing, but must be used as a *preventative* measure before war to ensure that no imperialist war is possible. By this I do not mean that a general strike is the final answer to the imperialist war-mongerers to be used only as a deterrent but can be an instrument in the struggle for finally ending all imperialist warfare by the seizure of the land, and the means of production and the setting up of the workers' state. 6. The immediate tasks facing us in our fight against war are : (1) To organise and build up our working class organisations in factories and T.U.'s. (2) To fight strenuously against all reformist illusions which hold back the workers from participation in active struggle against imperialist war preparations. (3) To organise mass campaigns against the National Government in its drive towards fascism and war. (4) To drive from the streets and factories the special instruments of capitalist oppression —Mosley's Blackshirt thugs. (5) To fight for free speech and the right of assembly. For democracy in the T.U.'s—against secret treaties and diplomacy and against the export of arms. (6) To bring to the workers, and especially to the women, the knowledge of what war means, its causes, and the means by which our own government is deliberately planning for new wars. (7) To popularise the peace policy of the S.U.—a peace policy only made

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possible by the overthrow of capitalism in Russia . . .

A. GLOVER

(*Chairman, Southwark No. 1 Branch Amalgamated Engineering Union*).

Professor J. L. Stocks

1. I do not think that there is any conceivable economic or social order which would in itself provide an absolute guarantee against war. But clearly a socialist economy would give greater power of control and prevention generally and therefore also in the special case of war. Imperialism is more difficult to define exactly; it certainly stands for ideas which have been closely connected with past wars, and the less these ideas prevail, the less (other things being equal) likely is war to arise. 2. It would depend entirely on what the war was about and how originated. I agree with Mr. Bromley's statement. 3. I do not know what the policy of the Soviet Union is, but I agree with every genuine peace policy. I do not know what is meant by an "imperialist" war on the Soviet Union. Is it supposed that some European country or countries might attempt to reduce Russia, or part of it, to the status of a colony of itself? But generally I should like to see all the nations of Europe pledged to one another to resist jointly, and if necessary by arms, any war-like aggression whatever. 4. If a race (e.g., any considerable part of India) took up arms to secure its independence of British rule, I should be in favour of refusing to fight it, and of immediately starting negotiations for a settlement. 5. The general strike is surely a very valuable weapon which, if well used in conditions of public opinion at all favourable might well be decisive against war. But it will always be difficult to find the right moment and an unsuccessful use of this weapon would be very damaging. 6. I am doubtful as to the possibility of a United Front of the working class irrespective of party (and nation?) against war. I am afraid that the removal of war must still depend in the main on (*a*) progressive removal of causes of friction between nations. (*b*) Building up of common services, &c., as a means of increasing international solidarity.

J. L. STOCKS

(*Professor of Philosophy, University of Manchester*).

Dr. Harold H. Mann, D.Sc., F.I.C., F.L.S.

1. Within the conditions of capitalism, —Yes, though it would be easier to prevent it if capitalism did not exist. Within the conditions of imperialism,—No. 2. I should refuse service of any sort in connection with the war and recommend others to do the same. I cannot conceive of circumstances when it would be right to assist in waging war on behalf of England. 3. I *do* support the peace policy of the Soviet Union. It seems, as a whole to be the only really practical peace policy before the world at present. I have supported it ever since the Soviet Union put its disarmament proposals before the League of Nations. In a war against the Soviet Union, I would refuse service of any sort, and would recommend others to do the same. 4. I think that a colonial people would be very foolish to engage in war for liberation, but if they did so, I would use every effort to assist their cause at home, in spite of the war in which this country was engaged. 5. I am doubtful of the possibility of general strike action against war . . .

6. (*a*) Individuals can let it be known that they will refuse to take part in any war, and get others to take a similar vow. I do not think war will stop till people refuse to fight or to take any part in it, heedless of consequences. (*b*) All can assist in developing international co-operation, of which the League of Nations is the existing, though a very unsatisfactory, embodiment. (*c*) Fight against any international trade in armaments, whether made by private traders or by governments. (*d*) Fight against profit making or competition in international affairs, on private account. (*e*) Insist, as far as in one lies, on a co-operative spirit in dealing with international

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

affairs instead of always considering British and foreign interests as being opposed. Work up a powerful feeling in this direction in each man's constituency which cannot be ignored by a candidate for parliament. I doubt whether a United Front of the working class movement is possible against war at present, but vigorous propaganda towards such a united front should be made, irrespective of any political affiliations.

(Dr.) Harold H. Mann

(Assistant Director, Woburn Experimental Station, Lawes Agricultural Trust ; author of "Land and Labour in a Deccan Village").

From the Honorary Secretary, British Anti-War Movement

1. Yes. It has been prevented on several occasions recently, as in 1920 by working-class action in the teeth of the firm resolve of the allied capitalist powers to invade the Soviet Union. 2. In the case of the colonial wars in which Britain is involved, I stand for the withdrawal of British forces and an embargo on the export of war material. In the case of a war in which Britain was engaged with a major imperialist power, I should work for a complete stoppage of industry, and appeal over the heads of the governments to the people of the "enemy country" to force the declaration of peace without delay. 3. I support the peace policy of the Soviet Union. In the event of other countries attacking the Soviet Union I should do all in my power to render assistance to the country of socialism. 4. I should approve of this in every case .... 5. General strike action against a war in which Britain itself was engaged could only be achieved on the initiative of a large number of working-class bodies .... I, therefore, favour immediate widespread propaganda amongst all sections of the working class, so that such independent strike action could develop into the general strike. 6. I do not believe a complete united front of *all* sections of the working-class to fight war is yet possible in Britain, but on the other hand, I have no doubt whatever that a far wider front than exists at present is immediately possible. To achieve it it is necessary to launch anti-war actions. Continuously to widen the scope of such action is the correct task of a United Front movement against war.

Neil Hunter

From a Trustee of the British Museum

War is a necessary result of over-population. It is found between plants and between every kind of animal from the anemone or snail up to man. It is waged most vigorously between the same kinds of animals and is mainly the result of a lack of the necessary food for their large number of offspring. In nature, it is somewhat modified because the death-rate is so enormous in the young stages of growth ; few "children" indeed, survive beyond the pair necessary in each family, to replace the parents. All the children struggle and fight to carry on their lives, and this struggle would seem to be a law of all nature. In man everywhere the same struggle is found ; it is, in its primitive form, most noticeable among "savage" races ; the child mortality here is enormous and excess of population is curtailed by tribal war.

In our civilisation we wish to retain all that is good and agreeable. We must substitute something to counteract this excess of population, and our best hope is in a reasonable system of birth control without undue loosing of the marriage tie, which undoubtedly in its broad aspects makes for happiness. No capitalist or imperialist wants war, for it is detrimental to his business and social aims and to his comfort. The excess of population with which he has to deal may drive him on to war. He may even be compelled to his own detriment. He cannot control this population ; it is a matter for all of us, not for individuals. War is hateful but the facts must be faced.

In the event of war involving Britain we must all stick by each other—brothers together ; only therein does our personal

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and racial safety lie. Our trade unionism has secured, and is necessary to secure a reasonable standard of living and public health ; it has done so and it has helped to form public opinion. Contrast the lives of our workers with those in the Soviet Union, the biggest dictatorship, over the lives of the greatest number of people, seen within the history of the world to the scientific man a great experiment, the evolution of which is of intense interest. It may be bad for the people of Russia, but what right have we to interfere with the affairs of another race so long as they don't affect us ? It is different in respect to British races in British colonies, but war here, with our own brethren, is inconceivable. It is less easy to think of China, Japan and India, for we deal with civilisations which are the antithesis of our own. The dominant white races of the world have built up systems of life and have evolved ideals vastly different ; we have to walk warily here for otherwise all our standards may be undercut with disaster to ourselves.

In conclusion, I conceive the best way to prevent war is to spread knowledge, that knowledge the underlying facts of population and its control. No war of this country can be undertaken save in the interests of the workers ; it cannot be undertaken without their approval. To call a strike under such circumstances must be directly against the interests of the strikers. Our main task must be to educate, and, if education fails, the question of population will have to be, as Roman philosophers said long ago, controlled by the State. Adieu then to that small amount of individualism which we all possess and cherish and which so largely makes for our happiness.

J. STANLEY GARDINER

(*Professor of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy, University of Cambridge, Fellow of the Royal Society*).

From a Divisional Labour Party Secretary

1. War springs from economic causes arising out of capitalism, the struggle for foreign markets is likely to become more intense in the future, therefore war is unavoidable within the condition of capitalism. 2. I should not hesitate to refuse to take part in any capitalist war, and recommend others to do likewise. I cannot conceive of circumstances where it would be in the interest of British trade unionists, to take part in war. 3. I support the proposals put forward by Litvinoff at Geneva for total disarmament. In the event of imperialist war on the Soviet Union, I should positively take part in an active anti-war campaign, advocating a general strike against it. 4. I believe in the right of self-determination for all subject races. Socialists should not hesitate to release the colonial people from the bondage of British capitalism, but I do not believe the natives should be handed over to the tender mercies of the exploiters in their own country.

5. Yes, we must use every means at our disposal to prevent war, including general strike action, whatever the consequences, the workers must be saved from another world war, the war machine with all its latest death-dealing devices could and would inflict such terrible suffering on helpless women and children too terrible to contemplate. 6. The fight against war should be given greater prominence in our propaganda. The rank and file would then realise the necessity of a united front . . . which is necessary and desirable to fight war and fascism. Let us cease to attack each other, and instead concentrate on fighting capitalism.

H. L. SELF

(*Hon. Secretary Eye* (*Suffolk*) *Divisional Labour Party*).

From the Secretary of the No More War Movement

1. No. 2. Resist. The N.M.W.M. differs completely from Bromley's point of view. It does not believe that war could possibly benefit the T.U. movement (though it might benefit Bromley and other T.U. officials) . . . If Bromley's hypothesis be accepted, it only means that " the interests of British trade unionism "

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could or might be opposed to the interests of the international working class.

3. I support the proposals made by M. Litvinoff for total disarmament. I am disturbed by the recent drift in Soviet policy towards alliance with French and American interests and membership of the League of Nations. I am especially anxious regarding Soviet support for the proposals (recently much under discussion) for so-called " collective security."

In the event of war on the Soviet Union I should obviously oppose it (see question 2). I should also oppose the entry of this country into war as an ally of Soviet Russia, in the event of imperialist rivalries breaking the Anti-Soviet bloc. (See answer to question 3.)

4. As an Englishman and a bourgeois I have no right to condemn any member of any of the subject peoples for any action of his against my race or class. Wars of colonial liberation should be used by us to stress the importance of an unequivocal opposition to imperialism as the first plank in the anti-war platform. We should demand independence for these colonies, the withdrawal of the British troops and the cancellation of British loans and investments abroad.

5. The desirability of such a strike is undoubted. Its possibility remains to be seen, and will depend upon many circumstances at present impossible to foresee—e.g. the general economic and political situation, the nature of the war, &c. 6. A united front should be formed of all who recognise that social justice is the only possible basis for the only desirable kind of peace. The test for this United Front, is to be found in the attitude to capitalism and especially to economic imperialism, which is the direct link between capitalism and war. The task of the anti-war worker should be educational and organisational. Organisation should be functional, and should aim at the maximum industrial resistance to war preparations *now* and in the *immediate future*. This should be supported by organisations in every trade and profession to oppose war, Fascism and imperialism.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS
(*Secretary, The No More War Movement*).

From a Trades Council Vice-Chairman

1. I think war can be prevented within the conditions of capitalism and imperialism by the setting up of a broad United Front Movement with its basis in the masses of workers (especially the heavy industrial and transport workers) which carries on propaganda to reveal the real nature of the impending war . . . and organises mass anti-war actions, such as stopping the transportation or manufacture of munitions, exposing the reality beneath the glittering air pageants, military tatoos, &c. Secondly, mass activity of the workers in economic warfare against the employers will have the effect of restraining the war lords' plans. 2. In the event of war involving Britain I should myself, and attempt to persuade others, to give effect to Lenin's great slogan " Turn imperialist war into civil war " ; realising that capitalism is the tap-root of war, and only with the overthrowing of the system shall we make wars impossible. Regarding Bromley's statement, I can conceive of no circumstances when the interests of the exploited and the exploiters will be identical, therefore of no circumstances when British Trade Unionism should willingly help " our " country in case of war . . . This speech of Bromley's should be exposed and denounced by all responsible trade unionists. 3. I am in full agreement with the Peace Policy of the Soviet Union, which is the essence of proletarian strategy, besides being the only *real* peace policy offered. In the event of war on the Soviet Union I should strive to give reality to the slogan I previously quoted, besides popularising amongst the workers the achievements of the Soviets, and the fact that workers are actually fighting against their fatherland.

4. A war of the colonial people for their liberation against British imperialism would

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

receive my support in every way. The popularisation of the demands of the struggling colonial people amongst the broad masses of the workers would be of first importance. The identity of interests which exist between the British and colonial workers would also need to be stressed. (These two things are necessary now.) A repudiation of the line of the Labour Party which holds that it is possible to govern the colonies humanely from Whitehall under the conditions of imperialism is of importance, as this reasoning appears plausible to the workers.

5. A general strike against war is very desirable, firstly because it would effectively stop a war, and secondly, because it would quickly develop into a revolutionary situation . . . The general strike against war will become increasingly possible in so far as the leadership of the masses is removed from the hands of the bureaucratic labour officials into the hands of the revolutionary movement, which is prepared to prosecute the struggle against war to the very end, i.e., to the overthrow of the system itself.

6. We can fight war now by the organisation of the masses of workers, intellectuals, &c., into a movement which does not prate of peace, but carries on practical and theoretical activity against war and threats of war . . . . Such a United Front's task should be to organise inside the seats of production and distribution all workers who are genuinely interested in fighting against war. Such workers should be organised into anti-war groups, and have as their task the popularisation of the fight against war, the organisation of anti-war actions, the support of any workers taking anti-war action and the exposure of all people, who, while pretending to fight war, are actually betraying the workers into war. Intellectuals, students, teachers, &c., should also be organised into similar groups to carry on work amongst their associates. Only in so far as such activity is carried on now will it be possible to think of carrying on anti-war work once hostilities have broken out.

MARION JESSOP

(*Vice-Chairman of Leeds Trades and Labour Council, also of Leeds No. 2 Branch National Amalgamated Union of Distributive and Allied Workers*).

James Maxton, M.P.

1. Yes, if the workers were sufficiently united in outlook, and correctly organised. 2. Devote all energy to the organisation of the workers and the preparation of their minds for the overthrow of their capitalist rulers. 3. To the extent that it is directed towards the method outlined in my answer to question (2), yes. On that aspect of it that depends on pacts with capitalist countries, I have little confidence in these pacts to stand the test of a war crisis, but they have some value in so far as they impress the workers of the various countries with the pacific desires of the Soviet Union, and the pacific aims of Socialists in general. 4. Support for the people who are fighting for liberation. 5. In present circumstances the question is much too academic for a positive answer. The answer given to question (2) covers the point.

6. Yes, united front is possible now to fight war, but tremendously difficult of achievement. With regard to the general strike, I cannot say, and no one else can say, what would be the most appropriate form of working class struggle in the circumstances that would be ruling then, and the general strike should neither be barred out as one of the methods nor accepted as the only possible one.

J. MAXTON

From the author of "Masses and Man"

As long as the struggle for peace attacks only the symptoms it is bound to be inefficient. He will shipwreck who is unable to realise that the antagonisms of capitalist society will always make for warlike solutions and that it is necessary to remove the causes. The only state following

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sound lines of peace policy is the Soviet Union. Her proposal of complete disarmament, however, has been refused. This shows the situation quite clearly.

ERNST TOLLER

From An Engineer (Mercantile Marine)

1. No. The capitalists having an almost exclusive monopoly of the organs of popular appeal can influence the majority of the population into support of a war at its outbreak. The movement against war certainly make the capitalists pause and think before plunging into war, but it is doubtful whether they can grow powerful enough to prevent the plunge. The capitalists know that many supporters of the anti-war groups are sentimentalists who have no real understanding of the causes of war and are therefore unstable and easily influenced by atrocity tales and the deceptive " idealistic aims " with which the real reasons for war will be hidden. The proletarian revolution giving the working class the monopoly of the organs of popular appeal is the only guarantee against imperialist war. Whilst it is most difficult to prevent the imperialists driving the people to war nevertheless the fight against war must be carried on now with all possible energy. Only thus can the attack of " war fever " which would follow the outbreak of hostilities be rendered less violent and its course shortened.

2. I should give no willing support to the prosecution of the war and by explaining the real causes of the War and in whose interests it was being fought induce my mates not to support and to oppose the carrying on of the war. Working as I do aboard ship it would be impossible not to give indirect support without refusing duty. To act thus as an individual would not seriously hinder the carrying on of the war. By staying aboard I should be in a position to fan every spark of resentment against the war and perhaps ultimately when the majority of my mates felt that the war was not their war participate with them in concrete actions to hinder the war and turn it from an imperialist war into a civil war.

3. Yes ! I have the greatest admiration for the way in which the Soviet Union utilises the antagonisms amongst the capitalist states to strengthen her own position and that of the weaker nations without becoming the tool of any imperialism bent on aggression. My attitude would be similar to that outlined in the answer to the previous question, with the difference that as an attack on the Soviet Union by the imperialists would be an attack by the capitalists on the workers I should emphasise this.

Mr. John Bromley " could conceive of circumstances when it would be to the interests of British trade unionism willingly to help our country in case of war." So can I, but not perhaps in the way Mr. Bromley intends. With Soviet Britain menaced by an imperialist state, Yes ! With any capitalist government in power, no !

4. To support the colonial people. They are liable to be oppressed by their own exploiters as much as by the British, but until they remove the British they cannot deal with their enemy at home. The expulsion of the British will weaken their own exploiters who invariably lean on the imperialists, thus the workers and peasants will be strengthened. Our oppressors at home draw from the colonies a great part of their strength to oppress us. By supporting the colonial peoples in their struggle for freedom we weaken our own oppressors.

5. If a general strike against war is possible on the declaration of war would the capitalists declare war ? I think not. However, I think the improbability of being able to organise a general strike on the declaration of war does not preclude the probability of being able to organise one when the people have experienced war and their feeling against war is stronger than it would probably be at the outbreak when large sections would be temporarily carried away on a wave of chauvinism.

Whilst the appeal for a general strike against war has a propaganda value, and helps to unveil the reformist trade union

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leaders, unless the organisations of the working class are very largely captured from reformist leadership the appeal would have little response. Before a call for a general strike should be issued it is necessary to be certain that the response will justify the call.

6. The question of what can be done now to fight war is a wide one. "War is a continuation of politics," therefore to fight war before it had broken out the main fight must be against the politics which lead to war. The present strength of the organised anti-war movement, to-day relatively weak, largely restricts this fight to an agitational basis. Persistent explanatory work on the causes of war must be carried on. If we really get the idea that a war will be a war carried on in the interests of the wealthy and will benefit the wealthy only into the minds of the workers then, even if to-day they do not see much need to enlist themselves against war, when war breaks out they will feel no enthusiasm for it and their developing anger against it will ensure mass opposition to it.

Whether the United Front against war is possible now I do not know. I understand that the existing anti-war movement strives for the United Front and has had considerable success. Whether new United Front proposals would draw in fresh sections, and without that there is no point in making such proposals, seems to me doubtful. There seems to be a danger of setting up too many United Front movements with the result that unnecessary committees and groups are set up consisting usually of the same persons one day calling themselves one name and to-morrow another, while the people we really want to influence are still out of reach.

Some points which I think would secure widespread approval amongst the workers are :—To struggle against all war expenditure, against recruiting to the forces, against the manufacture and transport of war material, against the Sedition Bill and for the right to carry on anti-war propaganda in the forces, against tattoos, Navy Weeks, and Air Pageants, and similar official war propaganda. Support for the disarmament, non-aggression pacts and definition of the aggressor proposals of the Soviet Union.

From the Secretary, League Against Imperialism

1. Yes, war can be prevented within the conditions of capitalism if mass action against war be organised immediately with a view to paralysing all warlike action by the imperialist governments. Such activity must be carried on, not in the conquering countries alone, but in the colonial countries as well, and it must be explained to the workers in these lands that their mutual interests lie in obtaining the freedom of the colonial lands whose position of bondage is the cause of poverty, the curse of the working class, and so presents a standing danger of war.

2. In the event of war involving Britain it would be necessary for all those opposed to war not merely to refuse to take part in it, but to organise resistance of all kinds, including strike action, to those conducting it, to proclaim the independence of all colonial countries and to demand the settlement of the dispute which had led to the war by a tribunal of workers representing each belligerent country, these workers to be designated by working-class organisations. 3. I support the peace policy of the Soviet Union. I recognise the services which it has rendered hitherto to world peace in advocating complete disarmament and in concluding pacts of non-aggression, after defining aggression, and in the event of imperialist war on the Soviet Union, my attitude would be as defined in No. 2.

4. I regard the existence of colonies as a standing menace of war and as the cause of the increasing economic depression and the general impoverishment of many parts of the world. I should therefore endeavour to paralyse the action of British imperialism should it engage in armed repression of a colonial move of any kind towards national independence.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

5. I think that provided it were planned in advance, a general strike would be the best method of preventing war. 6. We can fight war now by creating anti-war and anti-imperialist organisations, the function of which will be to explain to the masses of the working people the economic causes of war and the disastrous effects of imperialism both on the progress and development of the mass of the people in Britain as well as in the colonial lands, and with these ends in view a front of all sections of the working-class movement is possible irrespective of political affiliation.

REGINALD BRIDGEMAN

(*Secretary, League Against Imperialism*).

Leah Manning

1. No ! 2. Advise them to refuse to bear arms : to take part in any auxiliary war service ; to make munitions, or to release those engaged on work of national importance. 3. Yes. I would be prepared in such an event as suggested to give moral and financial support to Soviet Union. 4. Such a war ought not to be forced upon them. If a British Colony desires its independence it should be granted.

5. I am very doubtful whether T.U. opinion has been sufficiently mobilised to withstand the onslaught of propaganda which inevitably accompanies the outbreak of war. I have no doubt however that a general stand still is one of the most effective and desirable weapons to use against war.

6. Only useful for the mobilisation of opinion for war resistance, for the use of the general strike and for general methods of abstention if war seemed imminent. To suggest that it could prevent war within the present framework of society is to under-estimate the forces arrayed against it. I have not seen the context of Mr. Bromley's speech. But I can only support it if he meant that in the event of our becoming a Socialist State it would be the duty of Trade Unionists to take part in a war of defence against the aggression of some imperialist state.

LEAH MANNING

(*Ex-President of the National Union of Teachers, Parliamentary Labour Candidate for the Sunderland Division*).

From a University of Oxford Lecturer

1. I doubt whether under any political circumstances war can be prevented any more than natural insanity disease or death. 2. Assist to the utmost in defending British liberty, ideals and soil. 3. I have no evidence that the peace policy of the U.S.S.R., having regard to their excessive armaments and incitements to civil war, is an honest contribution to world peace. 4. A hypothetical question of interest only to those harbouring evil intentions against the historic contributions of British civilisation.

5. A general strike is the best way of ensuring the victory in this country of a foreign system of despotism whether communist or fascist. 6. The only way to minimise the risk of war is to talk less about it, above all less nonsense, to realise that certain unpleasant things are unavoidable in this world and to face the honest fact that when men are really angry and embittered, they will fight for what they want even with fists and sticks and stones. Thoughts are better concentrated in other directions.

G. R. DE BEER,
D.Sc., F.L.S., F.R.G.S.

(*Jenkinson Memorial Lecturer in Embryology and Demonstrator in Zoology, University of Oxford*).

Rev. Jack Bucknall

1. Wars are the outward and visible signs of an inward and spiritual disgrace. . . . As spots are a symptom of smallpox so war is inevitable under capitalist imperialism ; but just as vaccination can prevent an individual having smallpox so general public protest can prevent a war which threatens from breaking out at any

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moment. Only a society which is the outward expression of the alertness of the many in co-operative work and communal sharing, checking avarice, can guarantee a peaceful world.

2. Create a large public opinion against it. If this is impossible or powerless to stop Britain entering, work within the armed forces for insurrection leading to workers' control of the states involved. On no account must soldiers, sailors and airmen be regarded as other than of like passions and nature as ourselves, whose souls' salvation is to be found only in International Commonwealth.

IF Japan had a more ruthless ruling class than ours, and *IF* she were to engage in world conquest and *IF* inter-capitalist rivalries made war between the Japanese and the British ruling classes inevitable, then *IF* insurrection were impossible, as the least of the evils, better to support the British ruling class than the Japanese. Bromley's case is theoretically tenable under circumstances such as these, but being an average T.U. official he probably means by " our country " much what the Jingoes mean.

3. (*a*) Yes, generally, but in keeping alive the cry of " Disarmament " . . . . Litvinov fosters the illusion that disarmament in a capitalist world is possible. Only after the world revolution is disarmament possible. If this had been said by him as loudly as he has shouted " Disarmament " the world's workers would have been wider awake. Peace pacts, or rather, in this case " staving off War " pacts, do at least enable the U.S.S.R. to build up, but if in any way they compromise the world revolutionary movements, the Soviets are robbed of their final defence. 3. (*b*) Support the Soviets against the Imperialists.

4. If strike action could prevent war materials from being transported or even produced, well and good, but it would have to have big support from the large middle class and the unemployed . . . .

5. Educate against nebulous pacifist thinking and for Socialist ideas. Anti-war is negative. Socialism is positive. " Seek first the Kingdom of God and its Justice " and all, including the conditions of peace, "will be added." Any tactic which can expose secret diplomacy or secret movements of troops or arms, or the real nature of or real reasons of war should be used.

JACK BUCKNALL

(*Treasurer, Catholic Crusade*).

From a University Socialist Society President

1. By the mass action of the workers and their allies war can be prevented but only on condition that preparations are made beforehand, and the opportunity seized to overthrow one's own imperialism. It is impossible to prevent a war situation arising under imperialism.

2. In the event of war involving Britain, I should in no event advocate conscientious objection which means cooling one's heels in prison for the duration. At the front, in a labour battalion or at my job, I should engage in anti-war activity . . . towards bringing about the downfall of the war-making British Government and replacing it by workers' rule . . . I regard Bromley's symptomatic declaration with loathing.

3. Yes, but more stress should be laid on international solidarity. In the event of imperialist war on the Soviet Union, my attitude would be one of strenuous opposition. In the event of Britain being temporarily allied with the Soviet Union for war purposes, we have to support " our own " government during this limited period, while seizing every opportunity to escape from this position by substituting for it a workers' Government as soon as possible without weakening the Soviet Union's fight . . .

4. The war of a colonial people for liberation from British Imperialism must be supported in every way by the British workers . . . . We stand or fall together.

5. General strike action is desirable but only possible if prepared beforehand, and only successful if leading up to armed insurrection. The isolated slogan of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

" general strike " is harmful. In any case it must be organised here regardless of failures elsewhere (*vide* most recent excuses of T.U. bureaucrats *re* impossibility of general strike in Fascist countries).

6. Every section, workers (especially munition and ancillary workers such as railwaymen, dockers, miners, seamen, &c.), students (especially war researchers), the petty bourgeoisie, above all the armed forces, can be touched by a mass Anti-War movement here and now. Not only must blatant chauvinism be opposed but bourgeois pacificism. Exposure of militarist propaganda (air pageants, tattoos, Empire Day) must be undertaken, also preparations for sabotage of war supplies and the organisation of the General Strike . . .

Only the Anti-War movement can be broadly based enough at the present to carry on general systematic activity, building up the United Front of all opposed to war, accustoming them to acting together in spite of and against sectarianism. Having thus acted together it will be possible for them to face the incomparably more difficult task of preventing war when the war situation arises and, if this should prove impossible, overthrowing the régime of the warmongers under the leadership of the Communist Party.

R. C. MITCHELL

(*President, University College of South West (Exeter) Socialist Society*).

III. Extracts from other Replies.

Views on Bromley

" Mr. John Bromley was not speaking for his members when he made this remarkable statement, and in my opinion this points out to all thinking workers the type of men who have been allowed to control the trade unions of this country. It is about time we had a cleaning up and put these socalled leaders into the camp to which they belong. The workers have been gulled by them long enough."

ERNEST DICKENS

(*Committee Member, Manningham Branch, National Union of Railwaymen*).

" Advise Bromley to link up with Mosley."

T. H. WARD

(*Secretary, Birkenhead Branch, National Union of Railwaymen*).

" I can understand—when our country like Russia has abolished slavery root and branch, when children are no longer born slaves to the usurer—British trade unions being willing to assist in a war to prevent re-establishment of the capitalist yoke. But from now on I cannot conceive of any war undertaken by a capitalist government for capitalist ends being supported by the trade unions, knowing as they do the want, degradation, humiliation and deterioration—physical and moral—suffered by their own people since the war and caused by the war's aftermath of opportunism, callous greed and indifference."

J. J. DOE

(*Ex-Chairman, Lowestoft Divisional Labour Party, Delegate of Agricultural Workers' Union on Divisional Committee of that Party*).

Support of " Defensive " War

2. " I would definitely support a war of defence against aggression, though I am aware of the difficulty of discovering the facts as to the cause of war. I should certainly defend my country against Nazi-ism from Germany, for example."

C. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL

(*Department of Commerce, University of Liverpool*).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"With regard to the definition of an aggressor, I will content myself with quoting Burke: 'No one can define the point at which day passes into night, but every one knows when it has done so.'"

J. B. LEISHMAN

(*Lecturer in English, University College, Southampton*).

"It would depend on the nature of the war. I would support it, and urge others to support it, *if, and only* if, it were: (a) a war into which we entered to defend the international collective system against an aggressor state, or, (*b*) a genuine war of self-defence. But as Governments invariably dress up all wars as wars of self-defence I would be very chary of believing any such statement. In all other cases, I would refuse to support the war and urge others to do likewise."

MARGARET S. MILLER

(*Department of Commerce, University of Liverpool*).

"Nothing Can be Done"

"Nothing can be done to fight war, so long as the working and middle classes are as foolish as they are. When millions of working men can be stampeded into supporting reaction as they were in England in the election of 1931, as they were in Germany in the election of 1932, as they have been in Italy for a decade, what can one say about preventing war? The human mind is suffering from three delusions which paralyse in certain circumstances such small faculties of judgment as human beings possess. The emotional appeal of Religion, Patriotism and Nationalism (which are all false doctrines), can act in such a manner to turn the mass of men and women into mere automata, pulled by those operating the strings of emotion. There is no difference in the use of the false doctrines of Patriotism and Nationalism in the practice of modern states. Stalin, Mussolini and Hitler equally exploit the ridiculous modern worship of the State: which is an abstraction, represented by the same Stalin, Mussolini, Hitler, Baldwin & Co., their subordinates and their satellites. So long as the peoples are fools enough to place their mental equipment under the control of all this Nationalist-patriotic propaganda, their minds are in the same condition as the savage who worships the idol in India and elsewhere. The Indians will never get the British out of India, I told many Indian reformers from the lake Dahabhi Naoroji to the Mahatma, until India goes atheist. The people will never overthrow their economic and political oppressors until they become rationalist, anti-patriotic and tolerant in their outlook. But what can one do in the present low state of their minds? At one moment, they can be run into a European war by "Liberal statesmen." Who in their senses, knowing the character of these men, would have acted on anything they said has always passed my comprehension. Then abroad they follow a Kaiser, a Clemenceau (a man whose private life was so awful that the diaries of the De Goncourts in which it is described in close detail are still suppressed, because the French Government fear the consequences of publication), a Mussolini, a Hitler, and so on *ad infinitum*. Glancing through a list of delegates to a League of Nations Conference, I noticed that over fifty of them had committed crimes varying from murder, blackmail, sodomy, offences against children down to all the swindling and fraud that is the second suit of most European and American politicians. Is it surprising that men with such private characters can only be regarded with cynicism in their pretense to carry out the lofty ideals of the Covenant of the League of Nations? Europe really is a putrefying corpse and the peoples have chosen to put the body snatchers in charge as their governors. There is nothing to be done—except to wait for the end, or possibly hope that some revulsion may take place among the common people and they will render the present kind of government by thieves and crooks in Europe and elsewhere impossible."

C. H. NORMAN.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For a National Day of Protest

"I consider that there should be a national day of protest, a general strike called to bring pressure on the National Government. If the T.U.C. represents the working classes why don't they show their hand and make the Capitalists realise that it is their system of control that creates war and that the toiling masses should not be involved to risk their lives for something which they are not responsible for. We want action and it can be done. Let us make November 11th a day of protest not only nationally but internationally."

C. A. BERK

(*Transport and General Workers' Union, Tram section; Delegate to Wandsworth Trades Council*).

Colonial Question and Fascism

Since those military forces and methods standing ready for use in repression of reformers and ultimate protection of existing social relationships in this country receive their rehearsal in Britain's colonial possessions, if for no other reason, one would be wise to welcome their defeat and liquidation in the war of a colonial people for liberation. For me, however, a personal emotion fortifies this attitude. I feel a shame so sharp at my identification, as a relatively white British citizen, with the zoologically fallacious assumption of colour and race superiority involved in the measures of imperialism, that I rejoice at every victory of a colonial people in its struggle against the Empire.

IVOR MONTAGU.

Views on the General Strike

"He would welcome a general strike against war. He is not a trade unionist."

(*Stated in answer to the questionnaire by a member of the British Legion in an interview with a* LABOUR MONTHLY *reader*).

"No General Strike can ever succeed, without preparation firstly, organisation secondly and finally, objective."

GEORGE BRIGHT

(*Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers, London*).

"Owing to the disorganised state of the workers my opinion is that no success would be achieved."

J. BUTES

(*Amalgamated Engineering Union*).

On the United Front

"What is a United Front? The only way to combat war is to eliminate profits in armaments. Education on humanitarian and ethical principles."

REV. WILLIAM HODGKINS.

"Only a *Unity* in which Socialists retain the possibility of the necessity of a Proletarian Dictatorship and Communists agree to support the democratic method, within the mass Labour Movement, can fight war and achieve Socialism, and ultimately Communism, under which state of society war will for ever disappear."

F. ALAN STILES

(*Member of Fabian Society*).

"A general United Front against war is possible but it must be clearly understood that such an organisation can never be any more than a check to the warmongers, real prevention of war can only come as the result of highly disciplined action at the vital point of the modern war machinery—the FACTORY and TRANSPORT. If we are going to prevent war we have got to get the support of the broad masses of trade unionists, everything must be subordinated to this task. The United Front can do useful work of a secondary nature, but in the final analysis the only hope of preventing war (or fascism) lies in the Communist Party obtaining a decisive influence in the trade unions."

J. M. KINGSTON

(*E.T.U.*).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1914 AND 1934

By R. PAGE ARNOT

" Up to the very moment of the explosion, British Diplomacy had forborne to raise its mysterious vizor. The Government of the City was afraid to openly show its intention of casting in its lot with the Entente, lest the Government of Berlin should desist from war. London wanted war. That is why it behaved so as to induce Berlin and Vienna to count upon England's neutrality, while Paris and Petersburg firmly believed in its interference." (*First Manifesto of the Communist International*, 1919.)

THE military preparations of British imperialism to smash its German rival were carried on and intensified during the ten years before August, 1914. They were accompanied, not only by diplomatic preparations, but also by loud and frequent pacifist utterances from the Liberal statesmen. So complete was the secrecy of these diplomatic and military preparations, that the German authorities themselves were deceived as to the intentions of His Majesty's Government ; and the British people were deceived into believing that the " peaceful " British Empire, wholly " unprepared," was compelled " in honour " to defend the " neutrality " of Belgium. This legend still persists. It is therefore of the utmost importance on this twentieth anniversary of the first Imperialist world war to expose how that war came and how it had been secretly prepared in Britain, in order that the working class may be in a better position to meet the present war danger. For in 1934 we are living on the eve of a second world war.

Antagonism of Germany and " Unprepared " Britain

From the very beginning of the twentieth century, the antagonism between British Imperialism and German Imperialism had been growing rapidly. Britain, the oldest country of capitalism, had begun to lose its one-time monopoly of the world's markets to the newly-developing capitalist powers, in the forefront of whom stood capitalist Germany, with its high development of technique and monopolist industrial organisation. This antagonism on the world market was expressed not only in the tariff agitation, begun by Joseph Chamberlain, but in a sustained and steadily mounting jingo agitation against German goods, German immigrants, German " domination," German Navy, and everything else German. Field-Marshals and Admirals, newspapers like the *Daily Mail*, " socialists " like Hyndman and Blatchford, and pot-house politicians everywhere joined in the jingo chorus. It was the capitalists' ideological preparation for the war against Germany. This agitation was not only open but as widespread as all the resources of capitalist propaganda

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could make it, and the colossal increase of the Navy was unconcealed and unconcealable and indeed depended on the whooping up of jingo feeling to enable it to be carried through. All this was public. But the diplomatic alliances, the extent of them, and the precise military commitments remained entirely unknown, not only to the vast masses of Britain, but to the governing class itself, outside a small inner circle of the Cabinet and official experts. Everything was done to give a picture of coming German aggression against a completely innocent Britain.

In fact, so successful was the deception that in time it became embarrassing to its authors, who, at first receiving their meed of praise for their integrity, their devotion to peace, retrenchment and reform, began presently to be blamed for their neglectfulness in leaving the British Empire in so " unprepared " a condition. Hence, finally, after the war, Haldane, the War Minister from 1905 to 1912, and Winston Churchill, the First Lord of the Admiralty from 1911 to 1915, in writing their memoirs, were compelled to add to the old theme of " unpreparedness " an entirely contradictory theme on the subject of " how well we were prepared." In this defence of their own reputations they have since been joined by a horde of Admirals and Field-Marshals and Generals, &c., all writing their memoirs, all attempting to guide the verdict of history on their own deeds. All this makes it now possible to complete from these sources the revelations of what was kept secret from all up to the end of the War and only partially revealed by the Bolshevik publication of the Secret Treaties.

First stage of War preparations

The diplomatic war preparations of Great Britain, in the period of Imperialism, began with the conclusion of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance in 1901. In 1904, Lansdowne, as Foreign Secretary, abandoned the century-old tradition of no entanglements on the Continent and concluded the Franco-British Entente, which presently extended into the Triple Entente of Tsarist Russia, France and Britain. The Triple Entente was cemented in 1907 by the Anglo-Russian Treaty of Partition of Persia. Europe was thus divided into two armed camps for ten years before the War. From 1904 onwards and to a greater degree from 1907 onwards, it was only a question of where and on what issue the outbreak of war might be expected. In 1908 the Hapsburgs, with the backing of Germany, annexed Bosnia and Hezegovina. In 1911, over the Agadir crisis (Morocco), war hovered on the brink for several months. In 1912, over the first Balkan war, a European war was expected. Finally, in August, 1914, the war came—some three months after the Foreign Secretary, Sir Edward Grey, had denied in the House of Commons that there was any engagement binding the British Government to intervene in a war on the side of France against Germany and its

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

allies. This was a lie. It was to cover up this lie that the pretext of Belgian "neutrality" was invented by the Prime Minister, Asquith. But this lie was only part of the deception that had been practised upon the working class and the people of Britain over a series of years.

The Liberal Government (December, 1905, to May, 1915), which received the greatest Parliamentary majority for one hundred years in the January, 1906, election, was looked upon as a government of peace, retrenchment and reform. Actually it fell to this Liberal Cabinet, or rather to a small inner circle of this Cabinet, to perfect the preparation of war to smash British Imperialism's German rival. For over fifty years the British Army had been used solely for the expansion of the Empire by expeditionary wars against barbaric peoples. It was now to be transformed into an army for continental warfare against Germany. In carrying out this task, Haldane, the Liberal Imperialist War Minister, found that his Tory predecessors had taken the initial steps of creating, in the first place, an Imperial General Staff, and, secondly, the co-ordinating committee of all the armed forces known as the Committee of Imperial Defence. These were perfected under the Haldane régime and under them the Army was transformed. "The Expeditionary Force," said Haldane, "the Territorial Force and the Special Reserves, had been organised under my own eyes by soldiers who had studied modern war on what was in this country a wholly new principle." By 1908 this work was complete. The remaining years were spent in further perfecting of the Expeditionary Force preparations. "What we had by that time attained was the power to send an Army of 160,000 men to a place of concentration opposite the Belgian frontier and to have it concentrated there within a time which was fifteen days in 1911 but was a little later reduced to twelve days." On the other hand "the British Navy had been raised before 1914 to a strength unexampled in its history." (Haldane, p. 160.) The Navy and Army preparations were co-ordinated by the Committee of Imperial Defence whose Secretary, Sir Maurice Hankey, "planned and prepared that remarkable war book," which worked out in advance the minutest detail of war measures. "Not only the drafts of the necessary orders, but those of the necessary telegrams were written in advance under Sir Maurice Hankey's instructions." (Haldane.) All these questions were kept within the very narrowest circle ("secrecy was of course essential," says Haldane). Field-Marshal Sir Henry Wilson records a meeting of the Committee of Imperial Defence on August 23, 1911, to which, in addition to half a dozen military and naval chiefs, there were present only Asquith, Lloyd George, Haldane, Sir Edward Grey, Winston Churchill and McKenna. The full preparation was going on: it was in deadly earnest: and it was kept entirely secret.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The Anglo-French Entente, which Lord Lansdowne had perfected in 1904, had been supplemented by a plan of naval and military co-operation in the event of German aggression." (Repington, p. 15.) The Anglo-French "Military conversations," as the detailed joint strategy was officially called, were authorised on January 10, 1906, by the new Liberal Government, and, to quote Repington, "continued uninterruptedly until the outbreak of war in 1914. They led to the close co-operation of the British and French staffs and to the gradual working out of all the naval, military and railway projects for the delivery of our Expeditionary Force in France." Within the year a similar arrangement was entered upon with the Belgian authorities. "General Grierson thereupon instructed our Military Attache in Brussels to examine into the question of a possible despatch of 100,000 British troops to Belgium with the Belgian military authorities." (Wilson, p. 89.) Thus, seven years and more before the legend of "neutral" Belgium "violated" by German Militarism was created, the military preparations for warfare on the terrain of Belgium were carried through with France and with France's subordinate ally, Belgium. Similar arrangements were made for the Navy. "In August, 1912," says Churchill, "the Cabinet decided that Naval conversations should take place between the British and French Admiralties similar to those which had been held since 1906 between the General Staffs." "Again in 1912," says Churchill, "Britain transferred her whole Battle Fleet to the North Sea, and France moved all her heavy ships to the Mediterranean, and the sense of mutual reliance grew swiftly between both Navies."

The Highest Point of Deception

The highest point of the deception was reached in July, 1914, when the masses of Britain were bulldozed into accepting British Imperialism as a protagonist of peace at the very moment that the finishing touches were being made for the outbreak of war. Everywhere in that month there was praise for Sir Edward Grey's "strivings for peace": and the German Government itself was thrown into doubt. Under the date of Tuesday, July 28, 1914, Sir Henry Wilson notes in his diary, "the Russians have ordered the mobilisation of sixteen corps. The Austrians are mobilising twelve corps. The Germans and French remain quiet. At 3 p.m. a note came to Douglas from Asquith ordering the 'precautionary period.' This we did." *The Germans and French remain quiet.* The previous day to this the Admiralty had sent out the following secret wireless all over the world:

> This is not the Warning Telegram, but European situation makes war between Triple Entente and Triple Alliance Powers by no means impossible. Be prepared to shadow possible hostile Men of War and consider disposition of H.M. ships under your command from this

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> point of view. Measure is purely precautionary. No unnecessary person is to be informed. The utmost secrecy is to be observed. (Churchill, page 120.)

Actually the Fleet was mobilised and at its war station long before the outbreak of war, and while the academic debate was still being publicly conducted as to " whether or not Britain should be involved."

The final commentary on this highest point of deception may be supplied by the First Lord of the Admiralty himself:

> My own part in these events was a very simple one. It was first of all to make sure that the diplomatic situation did not get ahead of the Naval situation ; and that the Grand Fleet should be in its War Station before Germany could know whether or not we should be in the war, and *therefore if possible before we had decided ourselves.* (Winston's italics, p. 115.)

It is true that the War did not turn out according to expectations. It is true that the soldiers of the Entente were not marching along Unter den Linden, in Berlin, by Christmas, 1914, as the British and French General Staffs had so confidently expected. But these mistakes in the calculations of the British Imperialists (mistakes were also made by the German Imperialists) did not mean there was unpreparedness. They prepared for all they were worth.

The Working Class really " unprepared "

The " unpreparedness " was all on the side of the Labour Movement. The whole International, with its programme of opposition to war, collapsed at war's outbreak. Yet that programme had been clear and definite. At Stuttgart in 1907 ; at Copenhagen in 1910, at the special Anti-War Congress at Basle in 1912, the International Socialist Congress comprising all the Socialist Parties of Europe and of the world, had set forth its programme in unmistakable terms. The Basle Manifesto began with the famous operative clause already twice subscribed to by all the Socialist parties of the world:

> At its congresses at Stuttgart and Copenhagen the International formulated for the proletariat of all countries these guiding principles for the struggle against war:
>
> If a war threatens to break out it is the duty of the working classes and their parliamentary representatives in the countries involved, supported by the co-ordinating activity of the International Socialist Bureau, *to exert every effort in order to prevent the outbreak of war by the means they consider the most effective*, which naturally vary according to the sharpening of the class struggle and the sharpening of the general political situation.
>
> In case war should break out anyway, it is their duty *to intervene in favour of its speedy termination*, and with all their power to utilise the *economic and political crisis created by the war to arouse the people and thereby to hasten the downfall of capitalist class rule.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

" More than ever," the Manifesto went on, " recent events have imposed upon the proletariat the duty of devoting the utmost force and energy to plans and concerted action."

How was this unanimous policy of the Socialist parties and the Trade Unions of all countries carried out in Britain *before* the War ? The answer is that it was not carried out. The coming of war found the working-class movement " unprepared." In the twenty months after the Basle Manifesto, not to speak of the seven years since the original resolution of Stuttgart, there was no sign to be found that any section of the working-class movement was devoting that " utmost force and energy " which had been called for and which the situation so plainly demanded. A few books were published, a series of pamphlets were issued, but the systematic carrying out of the " duty of the proletariat " was so little prepared by the Socialist parties or their parliamentary representatives that it is safe to say that the organised working class of Britain, let alone the proletariat as a whole, did not know the war danger, far less was roused to the need of combating it. Denunciations of the armament mongers were rife, but were accompanied by a pathetic trust in the good intentions of Sir Edward Grey.

In place of the relatively precise analysis of the Socialist International, in place of the further detailed application of that decision there arose a misty and vague, if widespread, dislike of war which befogged any understanding of the cause of war. The precise duty of the proletariat was confused with bourgeois pacifism and the working class became more and more under the influence of the bourgeois pacifists. And there were no greater adepts at the game of " pacifism " than Mr. Lloyd George and his tail of Nonconformist Ministers.

Thus the chain was completed. The anti-war feeling amongst the working class was confused with the genuine bourgeois pacifism of an E. D. Morel and from this stage it only required a pacifist speech from Lloyd George or Edward Grey to convince many workers that all was safe. Thus, contrariwise, at the outbreak of war, the working class were prepared to accept the argument that if such a great lover of peace as Mr. Lloyd George or as Mr. Arthur Henderson now say support the war, then indeed, Britain's cause must be just ; then indeed we must defend Britain against the aggressor, or at any rate defend Belgium ; then indeed, we must join in this, the last of all wars, the war to end war. In the result, Mr. Arthur Henderson (that ardent pacifist between wars) was able to lure the British working class like cattle into the slaughter-house.

The ideological helplessness of the Labour Movement may best be gauged by taking the expression of its Left Wing, then best expressed by the *Daily Herald*, at that time a paper in opposition to the opportunist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policies of the Labour Party and the Trades Union chieftains. During the whole of that fateful month of July, 1914, up to the last three days, the *Daily Herald* may be taken as a classic example of " unpreparedness." Item after item is printed from the news agencies without any editorial pronouncement, without any sign that the *Daily Herald* had the least inkling of their meaning for British workers. It records that 1,600 delegates at the French Socialist Party Congress on July 16 voted the Jaures resolution for a simultaneous and International General Strike against war. It records the assembling of the Navy at Spithead. It records trouble in the Balkans. But nothing stirs it to raise the alarm amongst the British working class. Even after it is recording the exchange of ultimatums and armies mobilising, the *Daily Herald* goes slumbering on. Only when the International Socialist Bureau meets at Brussels on the 28th and raises the alarm, only then does the imminence of war really come home. But even so, on the 28th, on the 29th and on the 30th of July, in the editorial pronouncements of the *Daily Herald*, there is no mention of the responsibilities of the British Government, there is no criticism whatever of Sir Edward Grey, who is simply quoted as an authority that the situation is " grave." So helpless was this organ of the Left Wing that three days after Churchill had begun the war movements with his telegram of the 27th to all warships, they are still hoping for the neutrality of the British Government, instead of carrying on the most determined and ruthless fight against that Government. The helplessness and folly displayed reached the lowest point in their report of the great Trafalgar Square demonstration of August 3, where they choose out for fullest reporting and with evident approval the following passage from the speech of R. B. Cunningham Graham :

> Every civilised country the world over will feel a thrill when they hear that England, the mother of freedom, land of liberty, once more throws its might on to the side of peace and humanity.
>
> Our Ministers now sitting in conclave want the encouragement of a great popular movement to throw their weight into the scale of peace.

This, be it noted, was an " anti-war " speech. The partition obviously is pretty thin between this and the violent jingo speeches which this gentleman was delivering in the same month. It was not difficult for the Government to sweep away this feeble sort of opposition, or to convert such an expression as the *Daily Herald* gave of the " duty of the proletariat " into the duty of " fighting for King and Country."

Twenty years after

In 1914, twenty years ago, on the side of British Imperialism, there was complete " preparedness," earnest, thorough and deadly. On the side of the Labour Movement there was " unpreparedness," a policy of helpless drift and readiness to be bamboozled.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What is the situation in 1934? Once more British Imperialism is preparing for war, with speed, care and thoughtfulness. But British Imperialism finds itself in a new situation with entirely new problems. The War led to the General Crisis of Capitalism, to that epoch of wars and revolutions that has lasted since 1914-1918 and in which we are living to-day. The capitalist world of to-day is shrunk in size and over one-sixth of the globe exists in the U.S.S.R., the stronghold of world revolution. The Colonial revolution, only a cloud on the horizon before 1914, has swept like a series of hurricanes over the one-time Colonial preserves of Imperialism, has twice dealt shattering blows at British Imperialism, and has reached its highest point in the victory of the Chinese Soviets. The world market has shrunk to one-third of its former size: the capitalist system is in its death throes: in each country the advance of the revolutionary working class has become more and more threatening. In every country capitalism in decline is holding desperately on to its grasp of the means of production, and is already become a fetter on the development of the productive forces of mankind. In every country the capitalist class is trying out new fascist methods to maintain its robbery, with fullest development in Germany, Italy and other completed fascist countries. For the imperialists cannot wage war without securing that their "rear" is safe.

British Imperialism is confronted in a changed world with new problems and new antagonists. The Soviet Union represents a new stage in the development of mankind, against which the oldest capitalist power is fighting, trying by this means and that to build the effective anti-Soviet coalition. On the other hand America has become the great rival. And even though the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1901 to 1922 has now been transformed into a friendly understanding, even between such "friends" as Britain and Japan there is friction and rivalry in trade. And these contradictions give rise to still further contradictions. An American-Japanese war, with Britain backing Japan, would at once break up the unity of the "White Empire,"

But on the Colonial Empire of British Imperialism, together with its satellite Empires of Portugal and Holland, any war would induce a tremendous strain. The colonial revolution is knocking at the gate of British Imperialism. "England's emergency is India's opportunity."

Added to these new elements that transform the whole situation of British Imperialism is the singular instability of all alliances. The situation is more menacing now in Europe than it was in 1914. But perhaps the feature most pregnant with sudden war is the absence of fixed alignments, the rapid shifting of alliances, the hot fits and cold fits, the feverish convulsions of moribund capitalism. And with every fresh convulsion a fresh impetus is given to the rearmament on an unexampled scale of all the capitalist powers. "Preparedness" is universal.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What is the position to-day on the side of the working-class movement? Has the lesson been learned? Or is it once more a mess of vague pacifism, soon to be swept up and consumed like stubble in the fires of war? The vague "classless" pacifism still exists. But it is no longer an all-enveloping fog. On the one hand, the Trade Union leaders like Mr. Bromley and Mr. Swales, Labour politicians like Attlee and Henderson, have come out in their true colours. Last time they were anti-war Socialists in words but jingoes in deeds. This time, *before* the war, they have pledged their support to British Imperialism—of course with a proviso that it must not be a war of aggression (every school history shows that British capitalism has never undertaken a war of aggression). This time the part they will play is clear in advance; and was indeed already shown by the war preparations of the first and second Labour Governments.

On the other hand, the anti-war sentiment is growing amongst the masses of Britain, and within it, gradually and all too slowly, there is crystallising a core of revolutionary opposition. The essential need is that this core of revolutionary opposition should itself be clear about the working-class attitude towards war, should endeavour systematically and tirelessly to get rid of all confusion, of all elements of bourgeois pacifism amongst the anti-war elements. This involves a constant struggle inside the organised working class against all who pursue a policy of war preparation; and at the same time, in that struggle, to build such an anti-war movement as can take effective *action* against the warmongers.

The British Section of the Artists' International (Secretary, A. L. Meblin, 65 Marchmont Street, London, W.C.1), is holding an Exhibition in London during September of Painting, Sculpture, Drawings, Photography and Architecture dealing with the Social Conditions and Struggle of To-day. All artists are invited to contribute work to this exhibition, from which a selection will later be sent to the U.S.S.R. to represent Great Britain in an International Exhibition.

Already there has been an encouraging response to this invitation, and groups are being set up throughout the country of artists organising themselves to fight against war, against fascism, and for world socialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WAR FROM THE AIR

By T. H. WINTRINGHAM

IN the years immediately preceding August, 1914, one of the most effective press campaigns ever organised "forced" the British Government into an expansion of the Navy. "We want eight—and we won't wait" was a successful slogan: the dreadnoughts were built and formed part of the Grand Fleet at Jutland. A similar campaign, on an even wider scale, has been a feature of the past nine months. Its declared aim has been to "double and redouble" the Air Force. It has not succeeded. The Air Force is being increased, but only on a "Five-year Plan which will lead to equality with other powers" at the end of five years. And the Government claims that this "delay" proves the peaceful nature of its policy, its reluctance to enter upon a new armaments race.

The claim is false: the results of belief in it will be tragic. There are many workers and intellectuals who have been deluded by this campaign and the Government's replies to it into thinking that the National Government is for the present—at any rate—"going slow" in its war preparations. Actually it is going extremely fast. It has created an "Expeditionary Force" of aircraft of very considerable strength; it has reserves of machines, men and engines that are carefully kept secret; and behind the smoke-screen put up by Rothermere and Churchill—the demand to "double and redouble" the squadrons—it is working frantically to keep the technical superiority which it believes can win the next world war.

The Royal Flying Corps at the beginning of 1918 had 85 squadrons on active service between Flanders and Baghdad. The Royal Air Force to-day has 90 squadrons in commission, each of smaller size but of far greater hitting power and performance than those of 1918. This force, which is always "mobilised," is therefore not on a peace-time level at all; it is already on a level comparable only to the highest point reached during the first world war.

But this force is relatively very small—only fifth or sixth in order as compared with the world's Air Forces? Nonsense! Technical progress is so rapid now that *almost every squadron in commission in every Air Force in the world to-day will be obsolescent next year*. The effective squadrons of the Royal Air Force—those equipped with machines not yet obsolescent—are stronger than those of any other air force, except the forces of America, and (perhaps) the Soviet Union. To build fifty new squadrons of the R.A.F. next month would be to turn out hundreds of machines that could play little part in a war that began in 1936, and might be of restricted value even in 1935.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Air power depends on performance—speed, endurance, bomb-load, fire-power—and the ability to build rapidly. Twenty squadrons of out-of-date machines could not prevent a modern British day-bomber squadron from doing its work. And a fighter that is 10 miles an hour too slow has a 10 to 1 chance against it.

At Hendon in June, 1931, the "star" exhibit was a "Fury" interceptor fighter. At Hendon in 1933, a Super-Fury appeared. At Hendon in June, 1934, a "modified Fury," with a new type of engine, was shown which because of its added speed, climb and power of manœuvre made the older machine obsolete. In 1931 the original "Fury" was still experimental; in 1932 and '33 squadrons were equipped with it, in 1934 it is easily surpassed not only by its faster namesake, but also by at least two of the new "day-and-night fighters" also on view: the Supermarine (developed from the Schneider Trophy winners) and the Hawker "P.V." ("private venture"). This inescapable process of rapid change makes it sheer folly to build a big air force unless war is certain within a very few months.

Nations with a weaker manufacturing capacity naturally need a larger air force "in being"; they must rely on their stocks of machines rather than on their power to make new machines. The resources of British industry are well known: those available for immediate building of aircraft in a war situation include a very large proportion of the increasingly powerful Vickers' combine, great shipbuilding firms such as Swan, Hunter and Wigham-Richardson (who started working on aircraft this year), the Rolls-Royce factories, and the Morris-Wolseley motor car combine. These, together with ordinary aircraft factories, have the machinery ready to reach and exceed the production of aeroplanes reached in Britain during the summer of 1918 (about 2,700 machines a month). Their machinery is not being used to a tenth of its capacity.

Churchill and Rothermere represent that machinery and the capital sunk in it, the investors who have doubled and almost redoubled the value of aircraft company shares,[1] the profiteers who need immediate war. Their policy of "doubling and redoubling" is a policy of quick profits for Vickers, Rolls-Royce and the aircraft industry, but a gamble with the

[1]The shares in aviation companies have been a gambler's market for some time. They vary in price rapidly and widely: de Havillands, for example, had a highest level of 38s. per share in 1933, and a lowest level of 15s. per share. The best way to realise the enormous increase in the value of these shares is to take a mean price for 1933, the middle point between the highest and lowest levels, and compare this price with that ruling to-day. The result is:—

	Mean, 1933	July, 1934
	s. d.	s. d.
de Havilland	26 6	61 9
Fairey	23 0	30 9
Rolls-Royce	61 0	103 0

That is an average increase of over 75 per cent. in a year. Previous years show smaller but still considerable increases.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resources of British capitalism as a whole. It will not succeed ; it is not comparable to the naval " scare " of the other pre-war period. But the policy of Baldwin and the War Staffs is not one of patience and peace. It is one of steadily increased readiness for offensive action, for war from the air.

In 1932 three experimental night bombers were seen at Hendon. One, the Handley-Page machine (then unnamed), was put into production and squadrons were equipped with it in 1933-34. At Hendon this year a " second edition " of this machine appeared, the Handley-Page " Heyford " Mark II. " The speed of this latest verson has been considerably increased by certain improvements." (*Aeroplane*, June 27, 1934.) The first point in the Government's policy is to keep up the stream of " latest versions " of this sort, and to have sufficient of them on hand (not necessarily organised in squadrons) to equip an air force as strong as that of 1918 and keep that force going until new machines are built.

The second point in this policy is to be ready to make thousands of the latest machines when necessary, and find trained personnel for them. Here a policy of secret reserves is employed. The *Aeroplane*, earlier in the year, admitted this policy and referred to " very big reserves " and even " enormous reserves."

> The short service system, plus the newer system of bringing men into the Reserve of Air Force Officers direct without putting them through a short service commission, has built up a very big reserve of well-trained officers who . . . would provide us in a few weeks with a fighting force which would probably entirely alter our place in the scale of Air Power.
>
> The number of officer-pilots and N.C.O.-pilots on the Reserve has never been published. Possibly the powers-that-be do not wish it to be known. . . . We have also an enormous reserve of mechanics because of the number who retire year by rear.
>
> Naturally such quantities of pilots and mechanics would be of no use without aeroplanes and armament. Here again we are not so badly off, because . . . the various heads of technical departments have held fairly consistently to a policy of only accepting designs which can be put into mass-production on the outbreak of war.
>
> Some designs which are terribly expensive when made in dozens are such that similar aeroplanes could be turned out like sausages by chopping up and sticking together steel strips.—(*Aeroplane*, February 14, 1934.)

That is the second main point of policy ; ability to turn out aeroplanes " like sausages," and to man them. The third point is to have a large and increasing stock of engines on hand, because engines take longer to make than aeroplanes. In the increased Air Estimates this year the largest proportionate increase of all was that in the vote for engines and engine spares. The *Aeroplane* commented on this as " curious " because of the size of the stocks of modern engines already in existence.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These are the main lines of the technical policy. The strategical policy has also been developed rapidly. From Greenland to Singapore advance bases are being explored or equipped. The basis of this strategical policy has been stated by Mr. Baldwin, who is chairman of the Committee of Imperial Defence, in the House of Commons :

> I think it is well also for the man in the street to realise that there is no power on earth that can protect him from being bombed, whatever people may tell him. The bomber will always get through . . .
>
> It cannot be done, and there is no expert in Europe who will say that it can. The only defence is in offence, which means that you have got to kill more women and children more quickly than the enemy, if you want to save yourselves . . . . —(November 10, 1932.)

Captain F. E. Guest, at one time Secretary of State for Air, has stated that " the policy on either side will obviously be . . . striking at the nerve-centres of the civil population." Lord Thomson, the Labour Government's Secretary of State for Air, laid it down that " the way to win will be by the ruthless bombing of localities which, in many cases, will be densely populated." That is the task for which the Royal Air Force is designed and held in readiness.

For many years the main strategical preoccupation has been with the territory between the Himalayas and the Black Sea. In 1928 Mr. C. J. Grey, editor of the *Aeroplane*, laid down the technical lines of development needed for a war on the Soviet Union[2] ; in its main aspects this line has been followed out and even exceeded. He complained for example, that " none of the Russian centres of munition production could be reached by slow-flying night bombers." And in the " Heyford " Mark II. a night bomber has been developed which has a speed exactly double that of the German " Gothas " used to bomb London in 1917, and faster by 30 miles an hour than the fastest scouts used during the war.

This preoccupation continues : the flight over Everest was only a spectacular " trimming " to the constant work being done, mainly in " Hart " day bombers, investigating the possibilities of offensive action from the North-West frontier and Kashmir. And the aerodrome at Hinaidi, near Baghdad, has accommodation for six squadrons, though only two are needed there ; its vast aircraft depot employs nearly a thousand men. It is the base for bombing squadrons working from the Mosul area towards Baku.

But while this preoccupation continues a new one has been added to it : the probable need for " ruthless bombing "—to use the Labour Party version of the policy relied on—of a Soviet Germany. General Weygand's visit, and the complementary tours by the British Secretary for War and the Staffs along the Flanders frontiers, are not unconnected with

[2]See " Modern Aeroplanes and the Next War," LABOUR MONTHLY, August, 1930.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the need for advanced landing places and depots for the R.A.F. in such a war. The need has been stated clearly by Major-General Sir C. W. Gwynn :

> Our strategic frontier for Home Defence owing to the air threat lies not on the coast, but in the hinterland of Western Europe. For that frontier we must be prepared to fight.—(*Morning Post*, July 12, 1934.)

This is the crowning absurdity of the " Home Defence " camouflage : the " strategic frontier " for London's defence is now along the far side of the Ruhr ; the " strategic frontier " for the defence of the Ruhr runs through Windsor and Versailles ! But the ludricous nature of the plea must not obscure for us the nature of Major-General Gwynn's order to us all ; we must be prepared to fight for the strategic frontier—because otherwise " no power on earth can protect us . . . "

Major-General Gwynn is not the usual type of *Morning Post* " dug-out." He has been Commandant of the Staff College, Camberley : a position once held, I think, by Sir Henry Wilson, Chief of the Imperial General Staff in 1918. His " we must be prepared " is a statement not of desire but of fact ; British Imperialism is preparing to use its new expeditionary force to win and hold a frontier " in the hinterland of Western Europe."

Preparations for war from the air stand out head and shoulders above all other factors as the characteristic main feature of imperialist policy. And " no power on earth can protect us "—except the power which the Major-Generals and statesmen never take into account, until they have to : the power of the revolutionary movement led by the industrial working class.

R. PALME DUTT

contributes an article on

" British Imperialism as an instigator of War " to the current

" Communist International." (No. 15).

This is a special Anti-War Number containing articles by Page Arnot, J. R. Campbell and others dealing with the Labour leaders and War, The Nazis and war, etc., etc.

No. 15 will appear in a new type and on magazine paper. Get the *Communist International* to-day (Workers' Bookshop, 38 Clerkenwell Road, E.C.2), 3d., post free.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JUNE 30TH AND THE REVOLUTIONARY DEVELOPMENT IN GERMANY

By ERNST HENRI*

I.

THE men who led the proudest fascist army of the world, Hitler's generals, are lying with bullet-ridden brains in one of the refuse-pits of Munich. It is plain that the 30th of June, 1934, is connected directly, immediately, with the 30th of January, 1933, the day of Hitler's assumption of power. It is plain that Germany is now moving irresistibly towards a third convulsion, which will decide the fate of National Socialism and determine the power of the future. That is why two questions must be completely cleared up: Who was Röhm? What force did he and his "insurrection" represent? And from that the second question (to be dealt with in a later article): What force *now*, after the suppression of Röhm, is advancing and developing in Germany?

The fundamental thing is this: with the "conspirators" of the 30th of June it is a matter precisely of the same elements that on the 30th of January, a year and a half earlier, were standing at the foremost front of the fascist offensive, that indeed, actually brought about Hitler's victory. It is precisely the same elements that created and realised the tremendous *offensive dynamic* of National Socialism, that were its driving force and its victorious force, that force which gave Hitler the ability to overrun with such overwhelming impetus all the other groupings of power in Germany. The advance-guardist elements of the Reichstag Fire Storm and those of the June plot are *identical*. That is the first key towards laying bare the future development in Germany. Put shortly, it is the men—more correctly the commanders and the candidates—of the now activist and fascist middle class; of the middle class in all its simmering sections of millions: the urban small dealers, the clerks and officials, and the farmers.

* By permission of the Continental publishers of Ernst Henri (author of "Hitler over Europe") we are printing herewith extracts from his forthcoming work entitled "Revolution in Germany?" shortly to be published by Messrs. John Lane, price 2/6. These extracts have been specially translated for the LABOUR MONTHLY by Michael Davidson. All rights in Britain and abroad are reserved by the author.

Next month we shall publish an article by the same author dealing with the new political perspectives in Germany after June 30th.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

While Hitler, Göring and Göbbels, the official supreme triumvirate of the Nazi movement, represented in it more than anything the movement and substance of monopoly capital, the policy of the concentrated capital of the Ruhr (Thyssen), and drew from *there* their primary energy, their decisions and their slogans, Röhm, Heines and Ernst (as earlier Strasser) were the direct creations of the mutinous petty bourgeois masses, their immediate leaders, their heroes and their demagogues.

That is why Röhm, Ernst and Heines were, on the one side, precisely the most brutal and the most openly sanguinary among the notorious Nazi leaders and terrorists ; they reflected the spontaneous, anarchist frenzy of the foundering small bourgeoisie, that is being demolished by monopoly capital but struggles blindly against the revolutionary proletariat—the frenzy that takes the form of unbridled terrorist banditry. That, however, is why they were simultaneously, on the other side, those among the Nazi leaders who, for all their bestiality against the socialist proletariat, went on demanding at the peak of the party and in the councils of the State the so-called demagogic-" socialist " line, the line of the " continued," " second " revolution in favour of the masses and at the expense of the upper classes, of the broad social measures of the State in conformity with the original Nazi programme—whether through expropriation and nationalisation of the big stores, the co-operatives, a part of the landed property, the fortunes of the Jews, whether, even, through a raid on the property of industry and the banks. Here they reproduced just as involuntarily the truly revolutionary and unconsciously social urge of the interests of these middle and unemployed classes on the verge of ruin, the classes that had inscribed them on their banner. Hence this seeming, striking, contradiction in the political character of these people, the maximum of bestiality towards the left-wing working class on the one hand and the " leftest " position within the Nazi party on the other ; it was only the contradition of the middle class itself.

It is true that Röhm, Heines and Ernst, like the whole of this category of Nazi leaders, themselves and privately had long climbed high above the middle class and had become just such luxuriously living oligarchs as the other Nazi leaders of an openly capitalist nature, like Göring, &c. And there can be no doubt that, if this fraction really had won and had snatched power away from Hitler, they would in the end—to begin with checked by the objective dead weight of the capital-element in the national-socialist solution, then personally saturated—have slewed round unresisting to the same capitalist policy that was carried on by Hitler and Göring, and would have turned into just the same traitors to the middle class. A socialist fascism is in itself a contradiction, an absurd utopia, alive only in the demagogy of propaganda. But that would have happened later, after a victory in the fractional struggle.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the meantime, while the leadership was not in their hands and this rôle was being played by the triumvirate of the " civilian " leaders, the S.A. generals constantly felt not only that they were being driven by their masses ; they knew, too, that the menace to these masses implied also a menace to themselves, to the supreme mercenaries of the middle class, *as fraction and clique :* that the disbandment of the radicalised Brownshirt army, which Hitler and Göring had to carry through in the interests of monopoly capital, would mean also the end of the special power of this army's generals and marshals, their own fall ; and that on the other hand it was only with the help of this army, at its head and with its slogans, that they could achieve those objects, those new and higher positions of power and honour which their boundless ambition and luxurious needs had long been cherishing.

Thus the demagogic S.A. generals remained to a certain extent, outwardly, however, with great ostentation, the representatives of the middle class in the Nazi party and the Nazi leadership, its advocates, its activists and its hope. They remained this *after* the first apparatus of the leaders of the radical middle-class revolution, who tried against Hitler and Göring to convert the original ideals and promises of this revolution into practice, the famous group of the " Fighting League of the Trading Middle Class " (Wagener, Marwitz, Stöhr, &c.), had, immediately after 30th January, 1933, been crushed and had vanished out of Nazi politics. The break-up of the " Fighting League of the Trading Middle Class," the arrest and even murder of its leaders by Hitler in the summer of 1933, was already the end of the first desperate attempt to form an active left wing in the Nazi party. After the fall of this civilian fraction of the middle-class opposition, the S.A. generals Röhm, Heines, Ernst, Schneidhuber, Killinger, Heydebreck, Hayn, Detten, Schmidt, Gerd and others remained in existence as the *military* fraction of the same or practically the same school, and hence the entire gravitation and the entire pressure of the betrayed and murmuring middle class, which wanted at last to gather in the harvest of 30th January, 1933, became directed towards this circle.

Thus there arose the—at first glance astonishing and difficult to understand—conflicts of interests, Röhm-Hitler, at the supreme Nazi peak : on the rivalry between two cliques there was pressing from below the real and tremendously charged collision of interest between monopoly capital and middle class, between imperialism and the petty bourgeois, between the Ruhr and the small towns. The moment this conflict became so tense that the explosion was ripe, something had to happen at the Röhm-Hitler summit. This moment drew near in the summer of 1934.

II.

The middle class could not go on. By the summer of 1934, in the seventh quarter of the " National-Socialist Revolution," every category

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the German petty bourgeoisie found themselves in a state such as they had never been in before. The absolute dictatorship of monopoly capital in the Hitler State became fatal to their existence. The situation of the small dealer was desperate. While the big department stores, the co-operatives and the one-price shops, now under the management of Nazi bureaucrats and in the hands of Nazi shareholders, continued to dominate retail trade, the small dealer's turnover fell rapidly as a result of the tariffs for the Junkers and the cartel-policy of industry. It fell not only quantitatively, in that the dearth of purchasing power among the urban masses became decimated, but also the shopkeeper's average margin of profit dwindled away.

While the price of cheapest margarine rose by 30 marks a centner and the poorest consumer had to pay 30 pfennig more for a pound, the middleman's profit of the provision merchant fell from 15—18 marks per centner to 6 marks. The prices for meat and vegetables rose by 50 per cent. compared with 1933, for eggs, milk, potatoes by 100 per cent., for butter by 45 per cent. The result was that the small dealer, with the high price-level, had at the same time to pay more " turnover tax." In addition the Nazi party introduced its own private turnover tax, in that the small dealers had to put a bonus on all purchases made by party-members in the form of " coupons " in favour of the party funds—that is to say, of the higher clique of bureaucrats. When, however, the small dealer tried to get himself out of the mess by raising prices on his own account to his own advantage, he was crushed in the most brutal possible way, as happened, for example, in the Palatinate towns of Winnweiler and Rockenhausen, where all the master bakers in the place were taken into custody by order of the Nazi district leadership because they has raised the price of bread by 10 pf. a loaf.

On 21st March, 1933, all the organisations of the fascist small-dealers' association (" N.S.Hago ") were ordered to " refrain from any form of opposition to the co-operative societies " (and—without saying so—the department stores too). Persons contravening were threatened officially with " immediate removal from office." The category most closely related, the craftsmen, once enthusiastic Nazi pioneers and heroes of the fascist offensive in the years 1932-1933, were no better off. Of the 900 hairdressers in Breslau, one of the most typical and best known centres of the activist fascist middle class in Germany, Heines' town, 560 were by the middle of 1934, unemployed and receiving public assistance, unable to pay their rent ; of the 1,140 shoemakers 630 were on public assistance, for 480 hotel and innkeepers the town had to pay the rent, small carpenters and tailors had to be maintained artificially by the town as occasional workers.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That is a typical picture. That is the position of a member of the German town middle class—a year and a half after " his " revolution.

But most intense of all was the despair of the rural middle class—the farmers. Here in some parts the Nazis became overnight just as hated, sullenly and threateningly, as once they had been enthusiastically greeted as " saviours." While Hitler's policy of tariffs enriched the big agrarians, and while his unemployed policy supplied them with tens of thousands of bondslaves almost free of charge ; while the promised provision of new land for the peasants through expropriation of the big landed estates and peasant colonisation remained a ridiculous dream (in 1933 new land for the settlement of altogether 4,571 peasants was opened up, while even in 1932 Brüning settled 9,046 peasants on Junker or State land) ; while the Nazis' new agrarian control for eggs and milk piled up technical and financial difficulties for the farmers and delayed payment for their main products often for weeks and months, Darré's new " law of inheritance," the " axis of the Nazi future," brought the whole economic, financial and family existence of the farmers into complete disorder.

Tens of thousands of the younger sons of farmers saw themselves excluded from their paternal land, at enmity with their brothers and parents and delivered up without ceremony to ruin : all simply in order to make room for a new crowd of selected, rich, privileged Nazi farmers, a new caste of agricultural Nazi aristocrats. The Government declared openly that " the cramped space in Germany compelled the strictest selection of the future peasantry " (Dr. Kummer, one of the Agricultural Minister Darré's assistants). Hitler was quite deliberately pursuing on the land the same policy as in the town, with the monopolisation of the situations remaining in industry and in the offices for selected party-Nazis : the policy of creating narrow privileged Nazi castes as lower pillars of the dictatorship of monopoly capital. Entire districts with a specially poor and scattered peasant population felt themselves exposed to the danger of being deprived of their land and of themselves being sent off somewhere or other, like, for instance, the peasants of the Rhön district, where according to a national-socialist " Hellmuth Plan " 100,000 " surplus " small farmers were to be sent away to make room for 6,000 big " ancestral estates " for the Nazi aristocrats. Sent where ?

At the same time the Nazi Government stated under pressure of the Junkers that even in 1934 land could be made available for the resettlement of only 8,000 . . . Added to all this came at the beginning of the summer of 1934 the bad fodder harvest in Germany, which compelled many farmers, for fear of a shortage of fodder, to drive their cattle to market and dispose of them cheaply. The result was a sudden wave of indignation amongst the peasants on the land, exactly as among the middle class in the towns. In North Germany, precisely where in January, 1933,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the peasants represented one single colossal irresistible steamroller of National-Socialism, they had become by June, 1934, restless, so that in some villages the saying began to circulate : " We fetched Adolf Hitler with four horses—we'll drive him out with flails."

Every tremor, every gasp of pain of this middle class was reproduced at once, twice and three times as intensively, in these more than two million young people, who had stormed to the attack with the greatest exaltation and ferocity in order to save the future of their class, in order to safeguard their fathers and in order to win for themselves the full, carefree life of a ruling, victorious, lighthearted band of mercenaries. That was the ideal and the firm belief of Röhm's soldiers, the praetorians of the middle class. Their situation worsened with that of the civilian sections. Not only were the S.A. men not appointed to the governing State caste—that was the lot of the exclusive black S.S. and the Göring police, while the Brownshirts soon had to leave the police ; not only did they receive no adequate work, or work for which the wage was not much different from their earlier unemployment relief ; but also the life of the S.A. men became in the course of the Hitler rule more and more difficult and hopeless : the military drill, the grinding discipline, the fatigue duty, became much stricter than before the seizure of power, the contrast with the standard of living of the real Nazi bureaucracy, and particularly of the civilian " political leaders," became absolutely blatant. Individual S.A. detachments (as in Saxony) began collectively to put forward demands for a guaranteed minimum wage of 50 marks a week (compared with the frequent figure of 20 marks for those S.A. men who had got work). The number of the rank and file reporting for duty sank to 40 per cent. and under ; to make up, however, S.A. men began to sing new songs, such as " S.A. marches on, the bureaucrats go by car." Already in the first half of 1934 more than 20,000 S.A. men had to be expelled ; in many cases they were thrust into concentration camps and prisons, and by then the secret execution of Brownshirts had begun. The victors of 30th January lay far down at the bottom.

The new economic difficulties of the Hitler Government, the losses in the gold reserves, the catastrophe of exports, the fear of inflation, the beginnings of a shortage of raw materials and foodstuffs, were by the middle of 1934 aggravating the panic by leaps and bounds, particularly among the women of the middle class. And in the meanwhile the working class, the losers of 1933, standing outside the fascist front of the middle class but in close contact with it, outwardly silent but in the inside untiringly active, were now more than ever and clearly having an effect on the mood of the middle class. They increased and inflamed the discontent and indignation in these classes of people and acted upon them directly through the elements in the S.A. belonging to themselves, the proletarian unemployed—" Marxism's " channel to the fascist masses. The result was tangible.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The whole bombastic campaign organised by Hitler and Göbbels against the " grousers and cavillers " in May and June was nothing other than an attempt to erect a propagandist dam against this upheaval of the middle class—much more than against the " reaction " of the monarchist land-owners and officers (von Papen-Hindenburg), who naturally saw this movement and for their part wanted to turn it to their own account.

Only the numerically insignificant peak of the *upper* middle class and its S.S., those better situated shopkeepers, officials, big farmers, doctors and lawyers, whom Hitler really had satisfied at the expense of the Jews, liberals and socialists, so as to make out of them a devoted caste and guard for monopoly capital—only the upper middle class and its Blackshirts remained unaffected by the pauperisation of the middle classes and so did not share their newly accumulating indignation. But the main part, the actual mass of the middle class and above all the S.A., were approaching despair and turned their glance thither, where, rightly or wrongly, but with a confused instinct, they still saw their natural head and direct representatives: to Röhm and his generals.

III.

Röhm came into the foreground. This brutal and unscrupulous praetorian of fascism, without fixed political ideas, without the slightest respect or devotion for the " Führer " and his clique, without even the official fascist " morals," was suddenly, together with his pals, pushed by the development directly into a key position. He knew that he was still dependent upon the middle class and more than ever on that class's S.A. He felt, just as did Heines, Ernst and all the other original commanders of the fascist masses, that he had landed between two fires, between the open counter-revolution of the established Hitler-Thyssen and the smouldering " second revolution " of the lower middle class. The entire clique of fascist mercenaries saw that in this they were risking their position, the position of commanders of an army of two millions, from both sides, in that either Hitler would sacrifice them to monopoly capital and diplomatic interests (France's demand for the disbandment of the S.A.), or their own soldiers would have to desert them.

The S.A. generals were set in motion for the very reason that just recently even the last remains of the former *civilian* opposition of the middle class were demolished, the very last civilian radical leaders have vanished from the scene. The leader of the Corporation of Dealers, von Renteln, was " granted leave," the " Trustee of Labour " in Berlin, Engel, resigned, the former director of the Nazi trade unions and chairman of the Nazi fraction in the Reichstag, Stöhr, was sent to a little town in East Germany as Oberbürgermeister, people like Koch and Brückner, at one time the representatives of the peasant opposition against the Junkers

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in East Germany, dared not make another sound. This entire coterie of one-time specially " left " demagogues had become totally helpless.

The military leaders of the S.A. alone had still a kind of position of power in their hands, and even this would sooner or later be wrung from them. Röhm did not mean to put up with the fate of Strasser in 1932, or with that of the " Fighting League of the Trading Middle Class." The praetorians of fascism refused to be discharged by him so that the system Blackshirts-Secret Police-Reichswehr, that is, the innermost picked guard of monopoly capital might step into their shoes.

Röhm, Heines and Ernst did not take over the radical and revolutionary programme of the lower middle class and the unemployed Nazis. But they began to make use of certain popular slogans and demands in this programme, in order to strengthen their position above, with the triumvirate Hitler-Göring-Göbbels. Röhm, for example, issued a proclamation in which he openly stated that " certain social conditions have developed in such a way as to make it impossible for the S.A. to look on inactively any longer." He compared the high dividends paid by the joint-stock companies with the desperate situation of the unemployed S.A. men, and he began to play demonstratively with the idea of " new revolutionary actions " on the part of the S.A., as in the spring of 1933, during the first Nazi terror. In short, he threatened to " let loose " the Brownshirts again—in order to relax the pressure on themselves. Since, however, this time the " Jews " and " Marxists " could no longer serve as victims, Röhm and the other S.A. commanders dressed the whole action up in the form of an " attack on reaction "—that is to say, on the monarchist Junker class and—unuttered but inevitable—on the banks and industry as well. With that the inner conflict in fascism, the conflict between monopoly capital and the masses, came to the surface. Röhm only put forward once again the old programme of the middle class and of National-Socialism with the latter's celebrated demagogy against the " bank and bourse princes." But now, within the framework of an established fascist State of monopoly capital, this programme meant objectively a revolution against fascism. Röhm and the S.A. staff intended in no circumstances to go so far. But they came in direct conflict not only with the monarchist ministers von Papen, Neurath and Seldte, whom they accused of supporting the " reaction," but also with the capitalist ministers Schmitt (economy), Schwerin (finance), and Schacht (Reichsbank), who rose up against S.A. interference in trade and industry. The policy and the programme of the dispersed " Fighting League of the Trading Middle Class " appeared to have been again placed on the order of the day, this time by more powerful hands.

And over and beyond this Röhm began to clothe this economic programme in a new *political* ideology, in the ideology of a new, varied form

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the fascist State itself. The S.A. generals began to launch the plan of an *S.A. State*—a purely military soldier State of the Brown mercenaries, an absolute and crude dictatorship of the fascist military class over the entire State apparatus and over all other classes and castes . . . Around the so-called "Supreme S.A.-Leadership," Röhm's military headquarters, there began to grow all kinds of purely political authorities, which could have reason only as preliminary designs and rough forms of a future sovereign government, running frankly parallel and in competition with the government organisations already existing, while they were not in the least suited to purely military functions.

Thus there arose in the S.A. staff a special "ministerial office," a sort of independent political council for Röhm, who already before had secured the legal incorporation of the S.A. chief in the Reich cabinet; thus there was acting a special "press office of the S.A."—in evident competition with the actual press-monopoly of the State, Göbbels' propaganda ministry! The essential thing, however, was that Röhm was pressing quite deliberately for the monopolisation of all the military forces of the State under his sole leadership, for the absorption of the Reichswehr and the Stahlhelm into the S.A. That was the actual object of the whole forced campaign against the "reaction" and the monarchists, and in fact Röhm had already been successful in incorporating by force about 400,000 of the most active members of the Stahlhelm in the S.A. Now he demanded the final liquidation of the Stahlhelm and—the main point—the annexation of the Reichswehr. With that the absolute military sovereignty of the S.A.-praetorians would have been secured.

At the same time it is plain that the secret accumulation of arms was being undertaken by individual S.A. leaders. At the very moment that Hitler at last decided, at the beginning of June, for "a month's leave of absence for the S.A.," Röhm published an order to the S.A. men, which ended as follows: "If the enemies of the S.A. are nursing themselves in the hope that the S.A. will not join up again, or only in part, from their leave, then we will let them have the short pleasure of this hope. At the time and in the form in which it appears necessary, they will receive the proper answer on the matter. The S.A. is and remains the destiny of Germany" (this order was published in all the German newspapers). From this moment on the line of coming events was clear and only the ignorant international press saw the major weight of developments in Germany in the "von Papen conflict." In a secret circular that Röhm sent out to his subordinate leaders at the same time as the open order, he wrote: "Whatever may happen we are not going to part company; we are going to remain shoulder to shoulder, so as to be able to back each other up." The praetorians proclaimed their resistance.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The concrete happenings of the night of 30th June, that is to say, which of the two forces was the first to let fly and whether Röhm really had a complete " plot," remains of secondary significance. It seems that in fact Hitler and Göring themselves brought the whole affair to a head and massacred their former friends quite simply and without notice ; the technique of surprise and of the slaughter of defenceless people has indeed been made a fine art by the conspirators of the Reichstag fire. It must be left to the connoisseur of gangster romance and of sexual pathology to seek out the details of this dirty and bloody drama of German fascism. What remains decisive is that the open terrorist counter-revolution against the lower middle class and its military leaders, Hitler's Thermidor, was carried out on the part of the guard of monopoly capital and the upper middle class so rapidly, so unexpectedly and so bloodily, that the mass of the middle class itself found no time even to become aware of what had happened, let alone go out into the streets in support of the S.A. leaders. Once again it was shown with a positively terrible clarity that the middle class, as independent force, is unable to make independent " revolution " or mere mutinies even, in its own interests ; that it is either driven into the fight under the leadership of monopoly capital and for monopoly capital's interests, as in the spring of 1933, or it marches in alliance and under the hegemony of the proletariat in the common socialist interest (like the peasantry in Russia), or else it is oppressed and shattered, ruthlessly, bestially and even without trouble, by monopoly capital ; as in the course of the whole Nazi " revolution " in Germany since the 30th of January, 1933, with the logical and consistent conclusion on the 30th of June, 1934. That is the real direct connection between these two dates : the contradiction and the tragedy of the policy of the middle class, which sides with monopoly capitalism instead of with the socialist proletariat, the beginning and the end of an attempt to make out of a historically dependent and confused intermediate power a sovereign, proud and arbitrary class. The German middle class broke its head against the fascist wall which it helped to erect, broke it in such a way that it is improbable that it will ever rise up again—unless it be in alliance with and under the leadership of those whom it helped to massacre in the spring of 1933.

It is a lesson for the middle classes of all countries, which at the present time are everywhere being driven along the same road, as were in their time their German fellows. This road ends in the blood-smeared refuse-pits of Munich, in the terror barracks of the Blackshirts in Berlin. The German S.A., the pride and the mainstay of all the fascists in the world, no longer exist—at any rate not *the* S.A. that used to be. Of the seven members of the supreme staff of the S.A.—the chief of staff and the six army commanders (" Obergruppenführer "), at least three are dead and a fourth has been driven out ; of the few dozen divisional and brigade

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commanders (" Gruppenführer," &c.), the greater part are dead or under arrest, among them celebrated S.A. commanders like Ernst, Gerd, Heydebreck and others ; about 3,000 lower S.A. leaders are in prison awaiting sentence. The Berlin S.A. corps, " Horst Wessel's heroes," the " mortal enemies of Marxism," is in its higher grades knocked to pieces and destroyed almost without exception. All political organisations and offices of the S.A., the " ministerial office," the " press office," have been liquidated for good ; the S.A. may no longer have their own minister in the Government, and they themselves, if they go on existing, will do so only on a totally reduced scale (official announcements by Lutze and Hess), sifted out and completely deprived of rights ; the proud mercenaries become browbeaten recruits drilled into subjection. Into their place steps at last that formation which long ago—actually immediately after Hitler's victory—were destined to relieve them : the Black Guard of the S.S., those picked and favoured sons of the bourgeoisie and of the upper middle class, students, officers, big farmers, business people, who have always despised the S.A. and their fathers and who have at last had the chance of going for them as if they were a pack of mongrels, as if they were defenceless " Marxists."

The S.S. carried out the whole of Hitler's " action," they drew a cordon round the Brown House in Munich, they drove out in lorries to Röhm's villa and murdered him and Heines, they " sentenced," in the blood-tribunal held at the Lichterfelde cadet school at Berlin, the arrested S.A. men wholesale and put them up against the wall. The new S.A., however, now being " reorganised " by Hitler, is only a sub-division of the S.S., an inferior disciplinary company of the Blackshirts. The leaders of the Blackshirts—Himmler, Hess, Daluege, Dietrich—are the real heroes of the coup d'état and Thermidor of 30th June, and now, together with the allied Reichswehr, they hold the whole of Germany in their hands. Himmler, at the same time chief of the secret police, has in very fact become the German Fouché ; he is the effective dictator. Daluege, the leader of the Berlin S.S. and at the same time the police commander next to Göring, takes over the leadership of the entire S.A. of Berlin, Brandenburg, Pomerania and Eastern and Central Germany. Dietrich, leader of the East-German S.S. and commander of Hitler's personal bodyguard, and Hess, Hitler's political deputy, stand before the " Leader's " gates. And over the whole there hangs suspended, now as before, the hand of him who brought forth National-Socialism and who, if it mutinies, strikes it down too : the hand of Thyssen, the general delegate from the Ruhr. The victory of monopoly capital is complete. The defeat of the small bourgeoisie is catastrophic. But are these two forces, even after the 30th of June, the only ones remaining on the scene in Germany ?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DAILY INFORMATION

is essential in the present epoch of wars and revolutions

ESSENTIAL INFORMATION OF THE CLASS WAR CAN ONLY BE FOUND DAILY IN THE

DAILY WORKER

7d. per week, post free

41 TABERNACLE STREET, LONDON, E.C. 2

Do you read regularly

THE EDUCATIONAL WORKER

THE ORGAN OF THE
Educational Workers' League
(Late Teachers' Labour League)

It is the only publication dealing with the problems of Teachers, Schools and Scholars from a militant working class point of view

Price 2½d. per month
or 2/6 per annum, post free

Out on first of the month

Order now from The Manager,
7 John Street, London, W.C. 1

FIGHT

For One Penny gives special information on

WAR AND FASCISM

•

August Number

The Trade Unionist and War

Features for Women

The Last War and the Next

The Failure of Fascism

Reviews, etc.

•

BRITISH ANTI-WAR MOVEMENT
53 Grays Inn Road, London, W.C.1

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FROM THE ASHES

THERE HAS ARISEN

A MODERN PRINTERY

HAVING installed in all Departments of our New Works at Leicester New Machinery and Equipment comprising the most Modern and Latest Developments known to the Printing Craft, we are able to offer exceptional facilities and Low Prices for every class of Printing, Book-work, Magazines, Illustrated Catalogues, Folders, Litho Offset, or Stationery

SEND US YOUR ENQUIRIES

LEICESTER CO-OPERATIVE PRINTING SOCIETY LTD.

CHURCH GATE, LEICESTER — Also at London and Kettering

Published by the Proprietors, the Trinity Trust, 7 John Street, W.C. 1, and Printed by the Leicester Co-operative Printing Society Limited 99 Church Gate, Leicester

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED